The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24, 1935 NUMBER 1063

Contents

The Week 267

Editorials

Scottsboro—What Now? 270
A Professor Is Fired 271
Relief 272

General Articles

Questionnaire on Social Objectives 274
Planks for a Platform ..... Henry Pratt Fairchild 276
Europe's Balance of Power ..... W. N. Brailsford 281
Two Sonnets ..... Lola Ridge 283
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 283
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 284
Not So Deep as a Well ..... Otis Ferguson 285
To Make the Punishment Fit the Crime ..... Maurice Sagoff 286

Correspondence 287

Of Blackest Midnight Born ..... Stark Young 289

Books in Review

Plunge into Obscurantism ..... Louis M. Hacker 290
Eyes East ..... T. A. Bisson 291
"A Cabin, A Garden" ..... Martha Gruening 292
Elinor Wylie ..... Rolfe Humphries 292
Caste ..... Robert Morss Lovett 292
The Healing Art ..... Harold Ward 293
"Wisdom Lingers" ..... Lewis Mumford 293
Books in Brief 293

The Week

DURING the past week in Europe, everything else has been overshadowed by the conference at Stresa among the British, French and Italians, scheduled to begin on the day this issue of The New Republic appears. Few well informed observers are optimistic about its outcome. None of the chief Powers has altered its policy materially, and the stalemate is a discouraging one for the future of peace. Germany, despite her recent conciliatory gestures, still clings to her intention to tear up what remains of the Treaty of Versailles and obtain, primarily through military force, her place in the sun. The Poles have decisively rejected the Eastern Locarno; they will attempt a degree of neutrality as between Germany and France that is almost certainly unattainable and will lead to as much trouble as would open espousal of either side.

FRANCE, Russia and Italy want to overawe Hitler by a great display of force, at the same time binding Europe in a network of new treaties that hold no more hope than the numerous preceding documents of the same character that have disintegrated under the pressure of economic and military realities. The British, badly frightened by recent events, are seeking simultaneously to maintain a balance of power, with themselves as arbiters, and to preserve the status quo by resource to the machinery of the League of Nations—a frail boat on a stormy sea. German ambitions, in the meantime, have been checked slightly and momentarily by two minor events of the week: the comparative failure of the Nazis in the Danzig election, where they received only 60 percent of the vote and hardly bettered their previous position, and the international hullabaloo raised by the kidnaping of Berthold Jacob. Jacob, an anti-Nazi journalist, was seized by the Germans on Swiss soil and hustled across the border—a piece of gangsterism that very nearly sets a new low mark even for the ruffians who now control the Third Reich.

THINGS are at last moving again in Washington. The President has returned from his Caribbean vacation to find the work-relief bill, appropriating $4,880,000,000, passed in substantially the form he wanted. The administration has moved on to the social-security measure, where another hard battle may be expected. This bill, bad enough in its original form, grows steadily worse with each new modification. It now makes such a feeble beginning at unemployment insurance and old-age pensions that much doubt is expressed among progressives in Washington whether it may not be better to scrap the whole business and start over again in the next session. The administration is obviously somewhat disconcerted by recent election results in various parts of the country. In Michigan, last week, several thumping Republican victories were recorded, although in November even Senator Arthur Vanderberg had to proclaim himself an admirer of President Roosevelt and the New Deal in order to get reëlected. In Wisconsin, the La Follette Progressives obtained several victories, and in California, Upton Sinclair's EPIC movement, supposedly dead and buried, rose from the grave and elected half a dozen local officials. The handwriting is on the wall and is growing more distinct every day. President Roosevelt should take the trouble to read it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SECRETARY Hull last week took two actions in regard to foreign affairs. The less important of these was to issue a statement in the old American style, scolding the European nations for not having better sense about their economic problems. Our statesmen have been issuing holier-than-thou exhortations of this sort for many years, and there is no evidence that a single one of them has ever done the least good. The underlying assumption is that the European nations, through sheer moral perversity, are cutting their own throats—which is a tremendous oversimplification of the facts. Secretary Hull's other action, which may prove of great importance in the long run, was to denounce the restrictions that so many European countries now impose upon the importation of goods from the United States, and to assert that nations continuing these practices will in the near future be taken off the list of those enjoying "most-favored-nation" treatment.

THIS country is strongly opposed to the favorite type of agreement in Europe at present, which is virtually a barter arrangement between two Powers to the exclusion of everybody else. Not only do such agreements mean a sharp diminution in the foreign trade of the countries involved, but they prevent those triangular operations on which, in older and happier times, so much of the world's trade depended. There are two weaknesses in Secretary Hull's position: the first is that President Roosevelt gives him only half-hearted and intermittent support, and the second is that the United States sells to many of the important Powers more than we buy from them. One reason for this is our tariff policy, a heritage from Messrs. Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, when it was really believed that we could have one-way trade and that it could go on forever. Our successful efforts to prevent imports in the past have put us in a bad bargaining position, and Secretary Hull's well meant policy is therefore almost certainly doomed to failure.

IN AN editorial in this issue we discuss the fine report on relief problems in New York City recently issued by Mayor LaGuardia's special committee. Within a few days after this report was made public, the city witnessed an investigation of work relief by the Board of Aldermen that will long be remembered as a horrible example of what not to do, and how not to do it. The Aldermen started out to find everything wrong with the city's work-relief project that they could, and the daily newspapers abetted them in a shocking spirit of irresponsible sensationalism. A few research projects were unearthed that seemed esoteric and remote to Aldermen whose intellectual horizons appear to be bounded by newspaper headlines and murder mysteries; and certain recreation plans in the field of handicraft were held up to scorn by men whose own avocations would seem to be playing kelly pool and going to the movies.

WE TAKE it for granted that in a vast program of work relief like that in New York City there are sure to be certain items open to legitimate criticism; but the Aldermen and the newspapers seized upon projects that at most constitute a tiny and insignificant part of the whole scheme, and sought to give the impression that they were the entire activity. The motivation of the Aldermen came mainly from two sources: spokesmen for Tammany, which is angry because it can no longer get its fingers on the loot and looks back wistfully on the good old days under Mayor Walker when its graft and waste amounted to about $1,000,000 a day; and hard-boiled conservatives, who would like to see work relief stopped entirely, regardless of the disastrous effects upon the morale of millions of unemployed, and would keep relief down to a starvation dole. We submit that neither of these motivations is worthy of respect from serious-minded people, concerned to prevent the moral and physical destruction of one-sixth of the population.

THE governmental bureau that is at present most politics-ridden is the Department of Justice. Just before he went on his vacation, President Roosevelt ordered the Department to drop the Belcher case, which would have tested the constitutionality of the N.R.A. in the Supreme Court. The reason obviously was that he feared the Court might promptly declare the N.R.A. unconstitutional, and this would have a disastrous effect upon the proposal before Congress to extend its life for another two years. At the same time it was announced that violations of the N.R.A. would be rigorously prosecuted—about as reasonable as though the owner of a store were to tell his customers that the place was on fire, but that business would go on as usual. The dropping of the Belcher case caused such an uproar of protest throughout the country that the government hastily reversed itself. Within a few days, it was announced that another N.R.A. case had been found that could be taken to the Supreme Court—that of the A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corporation, in New York State. In this case the lower courts ruled in favor of the government on everything except the code provisions on minimum wages and maximum hours. Perhaps Attorney General Cummings knows why this is a better case to take to the Supreme Court than the other one; but you can safely wager something of little value—say a month's subscription to all the Hearst newspapers—that if he does, he won't tell.

THERE is a sense in which Edwin Arlington Robinson was not only the most distinguished but also the only American poet of his generation. That is, he was the only American who devoted his whole career to writing verse and refused every opportunity to capitalize his reputation—who never wrote magazine articles or mystery novels or memoirs, or edited anthologies, or went on lecture tours, or gave university courses in Creative Appreciation. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excuse he sometimes made for rejecting golden offers was that he was too timid to face an audience. But there was something more than timidity involved: there was the ideal of poetry as a dream and a vocation big enough to contain a man's whole life. Robinson held to this ideal at the cost of prolonged sacrifices. Even at the age of fifty, in 1919, the most distinguished American poet was living in a Brooklyn back-street, in two rooms of an ill heated, ill lighted railroad apartment, with his books piled in the china closet, on pine shelves varnished to imitate golden oak. Poetry played the part of wife, children, job and recreation. It was an ideal of stoical dignity that he bequeathed to younger poets, but he also gave them an ideal of honest realism. People forget that, in Robinson's youth, writing verse was a parlor game of the wealthy. The object of the game was to delineate, in a jargon polka-dotted with "whiloms" and "what-times," the joys of life in Arcady or Never-Never Land. Robinson despised the "little sonnet-men" who played this game with mechanic shrewdness. He asked:

> What does it mean, this barren age of ours?
> Here are the men, the women and the flowers,
> The seasons and the sunset, as before.
> What does it mean?

He tried to convey its meaning by writing poems in bare, straightforward Yankee speech, about "the men, the women and the flowers" he had lived among since birth. The trouble was that his two high virtues—call them dignity and honesty—ended by interfering with each other. The honesty caused him to write poems that were sometimes undignifiedly prosaic. The dignity forced him to lead a restricted and impoverished life, and thereby cut him off from the world of his time; without taking part in it, he could not answer the question, "What does it mean?" His later poems suffer from a lack both of sensual richness and of intellectual horizons: they are dramas of scruple, not of purpose; they are tragedies played in the twilight of a closed room. It is the earlier poems—the psychological monologues like "Ben Jonson Entertains a Man from Stratford," and especially the intensely felt lyrics like "Mr. Flood's Party" and "Luke Havergal"—for which he will be remembered a long time.

THERE is now better hope for Tom Mooney than at any other time since he was sent to prison on perjured testimony nineteen years ago. The United States Supreme Court, while refusing for the present to consider his case, has hinted about as strongly as it could that it will do so after he has tried the California courts once more and they have again refused, as often in the past, to serve the ends of justice. But court proceedings cost money, and Tom Mooney, after fighting for nineteen years to regain his freedom, has none.

> Based upon previous experience with court procedure and a knowledge of our efforts to secure a writ of habeas corpus in the federal courts [he writes], I feel safe in saying that if all goes well with us, I will have at least from twelve to fifteen months more to spend in prison. I do not mind that, but I would like to be relieved of the worry of knowing where the funds are coming from to enable us to carry this fight to a successful issue. I feel that every liberal and lover of justice and fair play, together with all working-class organizations, should at least relieve my volunteer attorneys of the burden of having to pay the actual expenses of these court proceedings. Their services, without fee, seem to me to be their fair share in this gigantic undertaking.

The American Civil Liberties Union, 31 Union Square West, New York City, is undertaking to raise the money for this, which every American believer in justice must hope will be the last, appeal for Tom Mooney (and also for Warren Billings, who will almost certainly be paroled if and when Mooney is released).

THE record of our relations with the Indians is one of the most shameful chapters in our national history. Even since the system of reservations was established, we have gone on steadily trying to take away from them even the little that has remained from their once vast heritage. In the course of a few years, beginning with 1887, under a new law passed at that time, we robbed them of two-thirds of all their land, and of the remainder, one-half was so barren that it was practically useless, even to the Indians, in helping to sustain life. (That is probably the only reason they were allowed to keep it.) In 1908, another new law took 90 percent of the land of the Five Civilized Tribes in Eastern Oklahoma, since when the great majority of these Indians have lived in the most desperate poverty. In 1912, the Chippewas of Minnesota lost a great part of their land, and in 1917, large numbers of Indians throughout the United States were persuaded to part with theirs under new forms of legal trickery.

AN EFFORT is now being made to persuade Congress to finish up the job of spoliation by abolishing all forms of federal care for the Indians, and turning them over to the far from tender mercies of the states. Already, this drive has had some effect; the proposed appropriations for the care of the Indians have been reduced by $3,000,000, of which $500,000 would have been used to buy land for the homeless, and $2,500,000 would have been loaned to those who already have land, but need assistance for the same reasons that operate in the case of white farmers. It is extraordinary that this drive should have come so soon after the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act of last year, the best piece of legislation in the country's whole history. We do not know what may be the motive of those who are seeking to abolish federal assistance; but an examination of past experience strongly supports the view that it would be a disaster of the first magnitude to the Indian.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE electrical industry has in recent years been extremely persistent and skillful in seeking to influence public opinion in the United States. A few years ago an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission brought out a startling mass of evidence as to the way in which important representatives of this industry had bribed newspaper editors and college professors, had supplied, free of charge, prejudiced "textbooks" to schools and colleges, and had sought in many other ways to create a public opinion opposed to lower rates, higher taxes or, of course, the construction of government-owned plants. The revelations of the F.T.C. caused such a storm of public indignation that the industry hastily promised to reform, and it did actually change the name of the National Electric Light Association to the Edison Institute.

BUT how genuine or lasting was the reformation, remains doubtful. The fight against the T.V.A. has been about as desperate as one could ask, particularly in those cities that were voting on the project to use government-produced power. The bill now before Congress to regulate and, after five years, to abolish the more iniquitous holding companies has been met by a terrific barrage of propaganda. Senators and Representatives have received thousands of letters identical in language, showing that they came from a common source. Quantities of these letters, purporting to be from poor widows with their savings invested in holding companies' stock, have come in identical black-bordered envelopes, causing the cynical to believe that the public-utility interests have supplied not only the ideas but the stationery. Employees of public-utility companies in various parts of the country have written in asking Congressmen to disregard their previous protests against the bill, which, they explained, they were forced to make under threat of losing their jobs.

A GOOD many public speakers are in the field explaining to their audiences just why it is that the public-utility companies are the noblest of all our institutions and why government production of electric power must never, never be. We were interested to see, the other day, some instructions prepared for the use of these and all others who present the utilities' case in any form. They were the work of Mr. Willard Cope, executive assistant in the public-relations department of the Philadelphia Electric Company, and appeared in Electrical World:

> Not less than 50 percent, and perhaps as much as 80 percent, of each unit of public-relations effort should be employed solely in attracting the attention of the public. . . .
>
> At least 95 percent of the remainder—that is, the "message" to be conveyed after the public's attention has been gained—should be addressed to the instinct of self-preservation; to the fundamental concern of every human being. This, it will be seen on reflection, offers wide latitude; it permits the recital, in striking ways, of all the points where individual and group welfare is linked to the welfare of the electric light and power industry. It creates the "We" attitude which is the cure of the industry's present difficulties.
>
> Only incidentally should the effort be directed to sheer reason. This does not mean that the reason should be offended, or ignored. Rare indeed is the mentality which does not have occasional flashes of pure intelligence. The point is that the unit of effort should be reasonable—that is, should have logical origin and guidance; but should be addressed, first, to the public's desire to be amused, and, second, to its concern for its own economic welfare. It is thus seen that the program has nothing in common with that of the so-called demagogue who considers these latter points only. . . .

It is interesting, we think, to get this more or less official estimate of the public's intelligence from a spokesman for the industry; but far more precious, in our eyes, is the definition of a "so-called demagogue": one who considers the public's concern for its own economic welfare. We shall remember that, the next time a representative of the power trust hurls the accusation in our face.

Scottsboro—What Now?

THE DECISION of the Supreme Court in the Scottsboro case was a notable one in several ways. For the first time in history the Court twice reversed the lower courts in a case involving capital punishment and, by its ruling in regard to the exclusion of Negroes from Southern jury rolls, it reaffirmed a principle of justice that various commonwealths in the South have long ignored. It did not, however, contrary to general impression, write a new legal bill of rights for the Negro and will not seriously upset established legal procedure in the South.

The principle that the exclusion of Negroes from grand and petit juries solely on the grounds of their race or color is unconstitutional was established as early as 1897 in the case of Strauder v. Maryland. This ruling was upheld the following year in the case of Neal v. Delaware and again in 1903 in the trial of Rogers v. Alabama. The Scottsboro decision, therefore, is important, not because it establishes a constitutional right, but because it tells those Southern states guilty of discrimination that they have been violating the Constitution for the past hundred years and that any indictment or conviction returned under such conditions is null and void. It will doubtless be cheering to the many Southern Negroes who have been tried, convicted and put to death, to hear that they have been executed in an illegal and unconstitutional manner.

Nor does the decision mean that the Negro will ever sit in the jury boxes south of the Smith and Wesson line. It is quite possible for the state of Alabama, for example, to observe the absolute letter of the Scottsboro decision and thoroughly to rape it in spirit. In so far as grand juries are con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerned, Negroes may be called for service and may actually serve. But, should an indictment be sought against a member of his own race in whose guilt he does not believe, any reluctant Negro juryman can be forced to concur in the indictment by the simple expedient of threatening him with violence. And, in regard to petit juries, the state, by virtue of the various challenges at its command, can easily dismiss any possible Negro juror. Not only does it have its peremptory challenges but it may challenge the unwanted Negro in other ways. The two questions, "Are you related to the defendant or any member of his family?" and "Are you personally acquainted with the defendant?" are ones that any Southern Negro, living a gregarious, communal life which brings him into close contact with nearly all other Negroes living in his neighborhood, will find hard to answer negatively.

The most important meaning of the Supreme Court's decision has not, so far as we know, been yet pointed out. It is simply that the Court has demonstrated that it will not accept the statements of petty state officials about the conduct of legal procedure in their localities but will investigate the matter itself. The Court gave the Scottsboro case as much thought and consideration as the Gold Clause case, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and it has certainly refuted the charge that it exists in a dead and spiritless legal vacuum, devoid of all humanity and understanding.

With these facts realized, and with Governor Bibb Graves of Alabama calling for a revision of county jury lists to include the names of Negroes, the Scottsboro case is both simplified and made more complex. What will happen now? Wisdom —even the most shallow and opportunist kind of wisdom—would certainly dictate that the case be dropped now and forever. The state of Alabama must realize by now that the chances are at least twenty to one that a new conviction will meet the same fate as its predecessors. It must also realize, merely through its pride, that by continuing these useless and vengeful proceedings it is dragging itself into disgrace and ill repute.

It would have been wise for the state to quash the case and free the boys—whose innocence has long since been established before the bar of public opinion—when Judge Horton so courageously set aside the conviction in the second trial. Such a step would be even wiser now. The Scottsboro case, during the last trial, was little more than a political bass-drum. The members of the prosecution and Judge W. W. Callahan, who presided, were not trying a case so much as they were making stump speeches. These gentlemen have received from the case all it can possibly give them. Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., the former Attorney General, is now Lieutenant-Governor. Other members of the prosecution have also been rewarded. Judge Callahan has been returned to office. What more do they want? What more can the case give them? It is not enough, as they are unquestionably aware, to carry them to positions of greater importance and power. And if they suffer a third defeat, as seems inevitable, they will lose much of the personal and political prestige they have gained.

It would be wise, also, for Governor Graves to take the lead in moving to free the Scottsboro boys. The Governor is out to make a reputation as a "liberal." By carrying the torch of the New Deal he seeks to repudiate the light he upheld in his earlier days—the fiery cross of the Ku Klux Klan. He has spoken brave and beautiful words regarding the Court's decision. He has declared that his only ambition is to see justice done. Here is his opportunity to realize his ambition and to prove his disavowal of his past career.

Much of the future of the case depends upon the reaction of the Southern press—particularly the Alabama press—to the ruling of the Court. We can only hope that the various Southern newspapers will stand behind the Court and place before the state of Alabama the futility of further procedure. Here is a magnificent chance for both Alabama and the South to deny all charges of prejudice, passion and hatred. It is a solution that may be accepted without dishonor, with a surrender only to those principles of humanity and justice for which the South, throughout its history, has always professed to stand.

A Professor Is Fired

THE STATE of Pennsylvania, at the instigation of its new and liberal Governor, George H. Earle, is now conducting an investigation of academic freedom at the University of Pittsburgh. The first few days of the inquiry produced some startling testimony. Dr. F. E. Butel asserted that he was forced to resign from the faculty after he had testified before the United States Senate committee investigating campaign expenditures by Senator-elect William S. Vare. Dr. Colston E. Warne declared that he, also, was forced to leave the University after he had publicly denounced inhumane conditions in the Pennsylvania coal fields. Mr. F. E. Woltman said he was dismissed when he had collaborated on an article for The American Mercury dealing with brutality by Pennsylvania's Coal and Iron Police and had presided at a meeting of the student Liberal Club, addressed by Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, to which the authorities had objected.

These revelations give added interest to the case of Professor Ralph E. Turner, dismissed from the University last summer on similar grounds. The American Association of University Professors has just made public a 20,000-word report on his case, written by a committee of educators who went to Pittsburgh and spent a considerable amount of time on the campus. The report is worth the consideration of anyone concerned for the future of academic freedom in America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Turner was dismissed, as Chancellor John G. Bowman admitted, because "there had been complaints" about him. These complaints were partly because of statements made by him in the classroom, partly because of his personal activities. When Chancellor Bowman forced the students' Liberal Club to suspend its operations several years ago, Professor Turner defended the organization. He also played an important part in the Pennsylvania Security League, an organization just the opposite in character of the National Security League of a few years ago. The Pennsylvania organization was created for the purpose of passing welfare legislation similar to that of President Roosevelt's New Deal program, and it was opposed by Pennsylvania reactionaries for the obvious and customary reasons.

The charges against Professor Turner that originated in the classroom were almost all based upon statements made by him in connection with a freshman "orientation" course in "the career of humanity." It is ironic to note that Professor Turner was reluctant to give this course, several times asked to be relieved of it, and continued it only at the urgent request of the head of his department (history). The charges were that he was "flippant" in regard to religion and that—shades of Darwin!—he openly espoused the theory of evolution. The report of the A.A.U.P. shows clearly, however, that Professor Turner was dismissed because of his liberal political and economic views.

Chancellor Bowman at one time told the investigating committee that the decision to dismiss Professor Turner was taken early in March, 1934, and that it was only kept secret from everyone (including Professor Turner himself) until the end of June, because the university was about to conduct a money-raising campaign, and did not want to be embarrassed by a controversy with a dismissed professor while it was going on. As a matter of fact, Professor Turner was specifically reëngaged on May 9, and was formally dismissed on June 30. The official records of the Board of Trustees do not bear out Chancellor Bowman's statement that dismissal was decided upon in March; the only record regarding the case of Turner is one saying that at a meeting on July 6 the trustees approved Chancellor Bowman's action.

Pittsburgh, like so many other American colleges, employs the outrageous system of reëngaging the entire faculty each year. This means that in order to get rid of a teacher, it is only necessary not to reappoint him. Under such circumstances, no one has any security of tenure. While notice of reappointment is supposed to be made on April 1, in fact it is frequently delayed until June or July, with consequences to the teacher's peace of mind that can easily be imagined.

The University of Pittsburgh also follows another bad practice, in that the dismissal of faculty members is entirely in the hands of the chancellor. In theory, the board of trustees is the responsible agent, but in practice, here as everywhere else, it is only a rubber stamp for the institution's head. Chancellor Bowman boasts that in his first year at the university, 1921, he dismissed fifty-three members of the faculty. During the last five years he has dismissed twenty-five more, most of them on the plea of financial necessity and dwindling classes during the depression. However, during the same period of five years fifty-nine men have left the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh voluntarily, including some of its best members.

In the year 1929 there was another instance of dismissal of faculty members by Chancellor Bowman on the ground of "radicalism." The New Republic at that time pointed out that the worst effect of such a policy as the Chancellor's would not be felt at once, but would come over the course of years, as the best men—at least in the field of social sciences—would look for an opportunity to escape to other institutions where the gag rule was not applied and the threat of dismissal did not hang over their heads each year. We think the facts cited have amply justified our prediction. Under the conditions that the American Association of University Professors have shown to prevail at Pittsburgh, few self-respecting teachers will wish to stay there. Chancellor Bowman may be successful—he obviously is—in obtaining huge sums of money from the rich conservatives of Pittsburgh; but the institution he is operating largely on their money does not deserve to be called a university in any sense that can be understood by the society of free scholars throughout the world.

Relief

THE BEST report on the problem of relief for the unemployed ever issued in the United States made its appearance recently in New York City. It came from Mayor LaGuardia's Committee on Unemployment Relief, of which Mr. George Z. Medalie is chairman and Mrs. Justine Wise Tulin, counsel and secretary. Its spirit is poles away from that of the aldermanic investigation, on which we comment elsewhere in this issue. While the report refers to conditions in New York City alone, it is equally appropriate to the problem throughout the country and, indeed, its most important recommendations could not be carried out without the coöperation of the states and the federal government.

The report points out that in New York City, one-third of all families now have one or more bread winners unemployed. Of these, about one-half, or 341,451 families, are now on relief. Both the total number and the proportion of those who are forced to ask the government for aid are rapidly increasing, regardless of the fact that unemployment itself, broadly speaking, remains stationary. Thus in two districts in New York, Queens and Richmond, the number of families on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relief has increased 80 percent in six months. The point is, of course, that among the unemployed who have not heretofore asked for aid, private funds are being exhausted. Even if conditions should not get worse, or should improve substantially, the relief problem is certain to become steadily greater for a long time to come. It will be augmented, moreover, by technological unemployment, already serious and growing more so.

The report makes a terrible indictment of the quality and character of relief and of work relief that is all the more effective because it is couched in the restrained and moderate language appropriate to an official document. The underlying weakness is that the problem is constantly assumed to be a temporary one only, to be treated with emergency methods. No serious attempt has been made at coördination of the various public bureaus at work on this matter. No real effort has been made to build up a well trained, competent personnel. The necessity for maintaining the morale of a group that is already one-fifth of the population and rapidly increasing, has been ignored. People are kept in idleness, or are put at work for which they are completely unfitted, or are employed wastefully on almost useless projects whose only merit is that the expenditure for materials they require is small. The duplication of agencies gives every incitement to fraud.

Not only is this true, but even the physical standards of relief are shockingly low. Definite signs of malnutrition are found in 20 percent of the children coming from unemployed families. Rent allowances are grossly inadequate. No serious attempt is made to keep the unemployed decently clothed, the result being a disastrous lowering of morale and a situation where, in thousands of cases, the unemployed person is prevented from even going out to look for work. One of the most stupid of the regulations is that which endangers the relief allowance if anyone in the family gets even a part-time or temporary job, although the returns from such activity, plus the regular relief allowance, might restore the family to a decent standard of living.

As a result of its exhaustive inquiry, the Mayor's Committee recommends definitely that work relief should be undertaken on a wide scale and that the attempt, for political reasons, to avoid "competing with private industry" should be abandoned. The committee recognizes, and does not blink at, the fact that such a program would need to be financed by a drastic increase in taxes. It sees that such a program needs to be based on a comprehensive and far-reaching public-works and work-relief project, undertaken with long-range planning for the country as a whole, and supplemented both by unemployment insurance and by a national and coordinated system of public employment agencies. At the end of its report, the committee sums up its conclusions in words that we should like to see read aloud at least ten times to every government official in the United States:

> Under a properly coördinated plan for work and relief in New York City, an unemployed person would register at the public employment service, be classified according to his occupational experience, and then be placed in private industry if a job were available. If none were available, he would then draw whatever unemployment-insurance benefits he was entitled to under the state or federal laws. If he was not entitled to such benefits, or when they were exhausted, he would be referred to a public-work job if there was an available one for which he was properly equipped. Only if he received no aid through these channels would he be placed on home relief. All persons placed on home relief, which is in fact an unemployment dole supported by public taxation, should be required at the end of every four-week period to reapply at the public employment service for work. The employment service would thus become the dynamic center of the entire unemployment administration. Such a procedure would result in the more efficient use of workers in both private industry and public works; it would decrease the shelving of people on home relief which inevitably makes for unemployability, and would substantially decrease the number of people who are either on the relief rolls because they do not wish to work or because they have made fraudulent claims.
>
> We recognize that no city can undertake the coordination of these services. The facts discovered in the study are, however, so convincing that we lay them before you [the Mayor] at this time with the recommendation that you take whatever steps are appropriate to lay them before the federal and state relief administrations for their earnest consideration.

These recommendations, of course, will be criticized as being "counsels of perfection." But they are not. They constitute, on the contrary, a minimum program if the future of our nation is to be safeguarded, and we commend them earnestly to Mr. Knauth, the new relief administrator for New York. When we permit a sixth or a fifth of our population to be destroyed, mentally and physically, as a consequence of conditions that are not their fault and over which they have not, and have never had, any control, we are offering convincing evidence that our rulers are not fit to rule, that our economic and political system does not deserve to survive.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Questionnaire on Social Objectives

THE FOLLOWING is the questionnaire sent out jointly by Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild of New York University and The New Republic, and discussed in the article by Professor Fairchild in this issue. Ninety questionnaires were returned, the names of those who responded being printed below, with a few exceptions in the cases of individuals who did not wish to be included in the list. As will be seen from the listing, only affirmative responses are reported, including those that were affirmative with slight qualifications, as indicated in the second column.

The following statement accompanied the questionnaire.

"The purpose of this questionnaire is to ascertain the actual opinions of the leaders of American thought, particularly on the progressive side, with reference to positive, concrete steps in the direction of social advance that they individually would like to see accomplished and would endorse and support. Please check each item in a spirit of tolerant common sense. Do not pay too much attention to the details of wording and expression, but try to picture the kind of arrangement that would be suggested to well informed people in general by the terms used. If you are in favor of the broad concept thus indicated, check in the affirmative. We wish to be free to use your name. The receipt of a signed questionnaire will be interpreted as conveying your permission to do so (unless you specifically request that your answer be anonymous)."

I: Attitude Questions

Judgment on the specific proposals recorded under II is to be interpreted in the light of the following general attitudes:

(Check those that you hold)

	Affirmative	Slight Qualifications to Affirmative Replies
1. Private enterprise modified by social reform will constitute the desirable order.	29	1
2. Reform of private enterprise should take the direction of encouraging small business and seeking to restore effective competition at home and more free trade abroad.	8	4
3. Reform of private enterprise should take the direction of accepting large business or monopoly and regulating it according to social plan.	14	1
4. Reform should combine (2) and (3) according to the nature of specific industries.	28	—
5. It is possible by a wide extension of public ownership to obtain *the main benefits of socialism while still* leaving room for the exercise of some individual business initiative.	39	3
6. It is desirable to work toward a socialist order.	50	1
7. Socialism can be approached by gradual measures, using constitutional means.	50	1
8. Government ownership or control of industry without control of the government by the working class (including in this class working farmers, white-collar workers and technicians of all kinds) is not socialism.	51	2
9. Socialism does not necessarily imply the domination of government and industry by the working class.	26	2
10. A socialist order order can definitely be established by non-violent, democratic political action.	45	3
11. Though a socialist order may be established by non-violent means, it probably will provoke forcible resistance by reactionaries which cannot be suppressed without violence.	48	4
12. A socialist order can be established only by violent insurrection.	4	2
13. War can be avoided by measures possible under the existing social order.	17	1
14. While war cannot be abolished by such measures, *the danger of its occurrence can be minimized.*	46	2
15. War cannot be avoided without the establishment of a worldwide socialist order.	34	2
16. Pending the establishment of a socialist order, wars of liberation by oppressed peoples or of defense by socialist states are justifiable.	33	3
17. War at any time and for any purpose is unjustifiable.	17	—

II: Action Proposals

(Check those that you favor)

A. War

1. Positive reduction of armaments by international agreement.	74	—
2. International economic boycott of an "aggressor."	40	3
3. Military and naval sanctions against an "aggressor."	12	2
4. Federal public ownership and operation of all plants manufacturing arms and munitions of war, including war vessels.	71	2
5. National and personal pledges not to engage in any war except in the face of the positive menace of territorial invasion.	39	3
6. National and personal pledges not to engage in war under any circumstances.	21	2
7. General reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers and encouragement of foreign trade.	60	3
8. Encouragement of economic self-sufficiency.	19	1
9. A general strike against a threatened declaration of war.	47	2

B. Social Security

1. The establishment, viewed either as necessary improvements on a permanent capitalistic system or as integral features of a highly socialized system, of generous social insurance, relief or pension systems covering:	85	
a. Old age.	85	
b. Unemployment.	83	
c. Sickness and accident.	83	
d. Maternity.	80	
e. Death.	76	
2. Prohibition of all wage labor of children under (*check one*) sixteen.	39	1
eighteen.	35	—
twenty-one.	9	1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Affirmative	Slight Qualifications to Affirmative Replies
3. A permanent federal public-works policy and agency for the reduction of unemployment.	75	1
4. Federal minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws for all wage workers.	57	1
5. The social provision and guarantee of a minimum level of living for all families regardless of economic status.	63	2
C. Public Ownership		
1. Public ownership and operation of a unified, exclusive, nationwide railroad system.	48	1
2. Public ownership and operation of a unified, exclusive, nationwide transportation system, including railroads, canals, air lines, bus lines, steamships, etc.	63	3
3. Public ownership and operation of a unified, exclusive, nationwide communication system, including post office, telephone, telegraph, radio communication, etc.	71	4
4. Public ownership and operation of all broadcasting stations, including use for communication, advertising, education and entertainment.	62	6
5. Public ownership and operation of all local utilities, including water, gas, electricity, power, underground and surface transit.	63	—
6. Public ownership and operation of a federal central bank and monetary-control agency.	59	1
7. Public ownership and operation of a unified, exclusive, nationwide banking system.	61	2
8. Public federal monopolization of foreign trade.	32	1
9. The public ownership and development of all underlying natural resources, including coal, gas, oil, mineral reserves, and also large forests and water power.	70	2
10. The public ownership and operation of all basic industries.	43	4
11. The social ownership of all material instruments of production except land.	13	4
12. The social ownership of all material instruments of production.	32	4
D. Taxation, Money, Finance		
1. Reliance on heavily graduated income and inheritance and profits taxes for the bulk of public revenue.	74	5
2. Reliance on land taxation for the bulk of public revenue.	10	2
3. A monetary system based on a fixed gold standard.	5	—
4. A monetary system designed and administered to maintain an even price level, or a stable purchasing power in terms of commodities.	43	2
5. Credit socially planned—that is, the administration of credit, both for short and for long term, not in accordance with general considerations of "the price level," but as an adjunct to industrial budgeting under a production and price plan that would accompany social ownership.	45	—
E. Labor Relations Policy		
1. A hands-off policy by government.	1	—
2. Compulsory arbitration.	5	2
3. Enforcement of collective bargaining with both majority and minority groups of workers.	21	2
4. Enforcement of collective bargaining with majority groups, contracts with these to govern conditions of employment for all.	46	1
5. Outlawing of all forms of "company unions."	51	—
6. Labor to have equal power with employers and consumers in N.R.A. code administrations or similar industrial government in the future.	67	6
7. Labor to have no responsibility in government of industry except what it wins in collective bargaining, unless it assumes complete responsibility in a socialized order.	14	1
F. Government Reorganization		
1. Passage of the legislation you favor, without regard to its presumed constitutionality, in the belief that the courts will follow the election returns.	49	1
2. The calling of a convention to revise the Constitution of the United States.	41	2
G. Civil Liberties and Fascism		
1. Free speech for all, including fascists.	72	1
2. Free speech for all except opponents of free speech.	10	—
3. Opposition to fascism by educational methods only.	28	4
4. Opposition to fascism by general strike or "mass action."	40	3
5. Use of violence, if necessary, to oppose a fascist coup d'état.	47	2

The list published below contains the names of those whose replies to the questionnaire are tabulated above, with the exception of four persons who did not wish their names made public.

Mr. Frederick L. Allen
The Hon. Thomas R. Amlie
Professor Thurman Arnold
Professor Read Bain
Mr. Roger Baldwin
Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes
Professor Carl Becker
Mr. Alfred Bingham
Mr. Bruce Bliven
Mr. William Bohn
Mr. Leroy Bowman
Professor Paul Brissenden
Dr. Arthur Burns
Mr. Harold S. Buttenheim
Dean Charles E. Clark
Mr. Evans Clark
Mr. Jerome Count
Professor George S. Counts
Senator Bronson Cutting
Mr. Lawrence Dennis
Dr. Edward T. Devine
Professor John Dewey
Mr. Frederick Dewhurst
Mr. Sherwood Eddy
Mr. Abraham Epstein
Mr. Galen M. Fisher
Mr. Waldo Frank
Mr. Benjamin Ginzburg
Mr. Louis Hacker
Professor Robert Hale
Mr. Mauritz A. Hallgren
Mr. Leon Henderson
The Rev. Hubert C. Herring
Dr. John Haynes Holmes
Mr. Ben Howe
Mr. Stanley M. Isaacs
Dr. Alvin Johnson
Dr. Horace M. Kallen
Miss Freda Kirchwey
Dr. William P. Ladd
Mr. J. M. Landis
Dr. Henry Goddard Leach
Dr. Henry Linville
Mr. Harold Loeb
Mr. Owen R. Lovejoy
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Mr. Benjamin C. Marsh
The Rev. J. H. Melish
Professor Broadus Mitchell
Professor William E. Mosher
Mr. Lewis Mumford
Professor Henry R. Mussey
Dr. Jesse H. Newlon
Dr. Henry Neumann
Professor Reinhold Niebuhr
The Hon. Floyd Olson
Professor W. A. Orton
Mr. Walter N. Polakov
Miss Evelyn Preston
Professor Walter Rautenstrauch
Mr. Eugene J. Reed
Mr. Milo Reno
Mr. Selden Rodman
Professor E. A. Ross
Dr. I. M. Rubinow
The Rev. Father John A. Ryan
Mr. John Nevin Sayre
Professor Sumner H. Slichter
Professor Vida D. Scudder
Dr. David Seabury
Professor James T. Shotwell
Mr. Upton Sinclair
Mr. George Soule
Mr. Raymond Gram Swing
Mr. Norman Thomas
Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard
Senator Robert F. Wagner
Dr. James P. Warbasse
Dr. Goodwin Watson
Dr. Frankwood E. Williams
Mr. Howard Williams
Professor Donald Young

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Planks for a Platform

How Far Left Does Progressive Opinion Stand?

I HATE questionnaires. I practically never answer them. Their questions frequently impress me as being vaguely, not to say inconsistently, formulated, their purposes seem trivial, and I am never sure that the interpretation of my replies would be in accordance with what I myself would make.

Why, then, did I assume the responsibility of imposing a rather lengthy questionnaire upon a large number of very busy men and women? The answer is simple and definite. For the past two or three years there has steadily grown on me the conviction of the necessity of prompt, intelligent, constructive, purposeful social action. Like everybody else, I have belonged to a number of discussion groups in which I have heard numerous urgent social problems expounded, analyzed and debated. But we always came out by the same door where in we entered. There might, or might not, be a certain degree of unanimity as to what ought to be done; there was practically never any determination to go out and do it.

It is a characteristic of the academic and scholarly mind, and of the prudent mind in all fields, not to act except upon the basis of full and convincing information and evidence. This attitude is frequently extolled as strictly "scientific." As one purist has put it, the scientist does not act, or even counsel action on the part of others, "until the evidence is all in." This has a fine, exalted ring to it. The trouble is that social change does not wait upon the conclusions of the cloistered academician, and, furthermore, the evidence is never all in. Society is inherently dynamic, and change is taking place all the time, regardless of the lucubrations of the scientist. The choice is not between completely substantiated scientific action and no action, but between action guided by the best factual evidence and rational analysis that scientific minds can marshal at the moment, and action responsive to blind impulse, ignorance, passion and selfishness, or mere haphazard, unenlightened good intention.

To be effective, guidance must be based upon a definite plan or on a set of concrete objectives. The leaders must know what they are aiming at, what specific social modifications they would like to achieve. It is easy to get agreement on generalized ideals. Every broad-minded person wants a "better distribution of purchasing power," "security for all," "a standard of living commensurate with the economic resources of the country" and "social justice." But these pious aspirations are not sufficiently definite to serve as blue-prints for reshaping the social order. Is there a group of leaders who also agree sufficiently on concrete measures of accomplishment so that if they can only get together they can map out the highway to well-being?

This is a question of vital and primary importance.

Such a campaign of action must obviously be based upon points of agreement, not of disagreement. This means that the program must be not only concrete but limited. A completely implemented social philosophy will not do. A statement of objectives that includes all the details of one person's convictions and aspirations will necessarily satisfy so few others that it cannot possibly become a basis for effective action. This is the slough of despond of doctrinaires, the certain nemesis of all "isms."

Any possibility of purposeful social change, therefore, depends upon whether or not a fair proportion of the leaders of the country's thought can bring themselves to agree on a limited list of crucial objectives, and, if so, what these objectives are. With the need and the demand for guided action becoming daily more insistent, with more or less fantastic and bizarre social panaceas winning followers by the hundreds of thousands, with third-party movements sprouting on pavement and prairie, while the populace is daily swayed by the fulminations of individuals who have no greater claim to leadership than the possession of a good radio voice, a gift for wisecracking, or a great chain of newspapers, there is ample justification for asking those who are really competent to lead, and who are imbued with the desire for human amelioration, to search their souls deeply enough to determine some few of the things they would like to see actually accomplished, and to take the time necessary to indicate them by a couple of dozen check marks.

Out of these convictions the present inquiry emerged. After several days of concentrated work on the part of three or four individuals, including members of the editorial staff of The New Republic, a set of carefully formulated questions was drawn up, which appears at the beginning of this article. Next a chosen list was prepared of 206 names, each one of which stands for something positive in the field of social thought and leadership. The factor of selection in this list should not be forgotten. This study must not in any sense be interpreted as representing a cross-section of the general thought and opinion of the country. How typical it may be, there is no way of knowing.

To the list so constituted, the questionnaire was sent, accompanied by the following letter:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> There is unquestionably a rapidly mounting demand for social change, and desire that the change be rationally planned and intelligently directed. The call for action is heard from every quarter. But action, and particularly intelligently planned action, requires a definite formulation of concrete objectives. This essential is notably lacking in many of the so-called platforms of liberal and radical agencies, as well as in the pronouncements of the champions of reform.
>
> Scarcely any practical measure could be of greater importance and value at the present moment than a consolidated presentation of the mature convictions of the leaders of thought in this country as to what they would like to see actually done. With this in mind, the editors of The New Republic are joining with me in an effort to obtain such a statement. The accompanying questionnaire is being sent to a small number of the representatives of social thinking. We shall greatly appreciate your participation in this venture, and I believe you may rest assured that the results will have far more than a mere academic or journalistic significance. As there are special reasons for promptitude, we shall be particularly grateful if your response can be received within a week or ten days. With hearty appreciation of whatever assistance you may give, I am, ...

This letter, and the accompanying instructions, were intended to make it clear that what the questionnaire sought to discover was how many of the men and women included were ready to back up certain well defined and limited objectives, not to ascertain their entire social philosophy or plan of social regeneration. The results indicate that it would have been well if this point could have been made more emphatic, for several of the recipients complain that the questionnaire does not permit the expression of their entire philosophy, or omits important things that they would like to vote for.

In the aggregate, ninety completed questionnaires were received, including a few that, through intent or inadvertence, were not signed. Four of the participators who signed requested that their names should not be revealed. In addition to these, there were nearly fifty replies received from persons who, for a variety of reasons, did not see their way clear to answer the questions, but whose comments or observations are in many instances equally significant and illuminating with the questionnaires themselves. These fall into several fairly definite groups.

The first group includes those who do not believe in questionnaires, or do not think it possible to construct a set of questions in such a field to which a conscientious and intelligent person can commit himself. Thus the president of one of the leading Eastern universities writes:

> I do not believe that on questionnaires it is ever possible to give a true answer to one's attitude on complex social problems,

and one of the foremost journalistic molders of thought says:

> I should not feel that I could answer most of the important questions in it by a simple yes or no.

These replies are of tremendous importance. They raise this question: If three or four men, all more or less specialists in social thought and its expression, working together for some days, cannot formulate a statement of certain definite social objectives of which an intelligent citizen can express his approval or disapproval, what is the chance of any rationally planned and deliberately guided social action, and particularly, what is the prospect of forming a new political party or rejuvenating one of the old parties in such a way as to afford a rallying point for liberal sentiment? Perhaps the acme of this attitude is expressed by a prominent educator, who writes:

> I believe that social planning is useful only as a method of critical attack. I doubt very much its constructive utility. Certainly I am tired of the old symbols which are now clogging up our machinery of distribution. I am utterly unable to say, however, what will be the names of the new ones which we will adopt when we finally settle down. I question if intellectuals will have very much control over the selection of these names.

Closely related to this group are the replies that indicate the impossibility of participation because the questions are not worded just as the writer would wish. Thus a social worker writes:

> Some of the items I should like to check are not mentioned in the questionnaire. Others which are in the questionnaire and which I might be inclined to check are not worded the way I would.

Then there is the type of disinclination to answer that rests upon the sense of incompetence of the writer, as illustrated by the statement of a prominent clergyman:

> A man really ought to be a thoroughly trained expert economist and sociologist to answer so detailed and thoroughgoing a questionnaire. . . . I shall get to it if I possibly can.

There are some whose official position makes it inappropriate for them to participate, and a few who say simply and frankly that they have not time. This latter group, interestingly enough, includes one man who is devoting more time and exceptional ability to the promotion of rather radical social change than almost any other man in the country.

Not a single college president filled in the questionnaire, though most of them replied courteously. This is particularly noteworthy in view of the hoary American tradition that every college president, by virtue of his office, is a competent authority on any social question whatsoever. No replies of any kind were received from those who would be recognized as leaders of communistic thought.

It is obvious that one's reaction to a questionnaire depends partly upon the importance he attaches to it. It will be conceded without argument that if this questionnaire had been sent by President Roosevelt as a basis for obtaining guidance to help him plan a new New Deal, practically all of those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who received it would have managed to find time to fill out the blank, and would have been able to arrive at a decision on at least a few of the items. The fact that so large a proportion of the recipients did reply in some way indicates their recognition of the intrinsic significance of such an inquiry, regardless of its source. Many of the comments testify to a conviction that in the present crisis less social injury is to be feared from action based upon only partial information and illumination than from delay caused by a conscientious insistence upon complete enlightenment.

Many of the ninety completed questionnaires that were received bear annotations, or are accompanied by letters, that reveal the participant's recognition of the importance of coöperating in the project, in spite of a natural reluctance to commit himself positively on statements that are not worded in a way precisely satisfactory to him, or that involve some inevitable element of vagueness. The result is a body of mature opinion that is of deep significance.

It will be noted that the items on the questionnaire are divided into two main groups, the first having to do with attitudes, the second with specific objectives or goals of action. The purpose of the first section is twofold: to reveal the frequency of the attitudes themselves, and to furnish the individual participant an opportunity to set up a philosophic background against which to project his endorsement of practical measures. The degree of unanimity that appears on many of the most important points is striking and significant.

It will be observed that the attitudes that are regarded as of central importance for this study are those dealing with the socialization of the economic order, the abolition of war, and the relationship between the two. Number 1, the most conservative, indicates a general acceptance of the present capitalistic order, with the tacit implication that no one on the list would deny the need of some real reform in it. The next three items give opportunity for the endorsement of certain generalized types of reform. Item number 5 introduces the idea of a socialistic reorganization with allowance for the continuation of a certain amount of privately controlled business, while number 6 permits the participant to commit himself definitely to a broadly conceived socialistic order. Items 7 to 12 present certain definitions of the socialistic concept, and various means of obtaining its realization. The next five questions allow for the expression of generalized attitudes about the elimination of war, involving the possibility, the desirability and the means.

The figures attached to each item on the questionnaire printed at the head of this article indicate the total affirmative vote. The heading, "Slight Qualifications," stands for minor amendments or interpretations that do not really affect the intent of the question but permit the recording of a vote that might not otherwise seem justified.

The vote of twenty-nine for the first item on the list (I, 1) indicates that about one-third of the participants are in favor of the continuance of the existing social order, but recognize the necessity of far-reaching improvements. (The lone vote for a hands-off policy by government in labor relations [II, E, 1] is significant in this connection.) A small number believe that these reforms should be centered on the restoration of free competition, particularly in the interest of the small business man and free foreign trade, while a larger number finds the main hope in the curbing of monopoly and the regulation of big business. This group as a whole, however, evidently believes that there is no comprehensive formula for reform, but that specific industries must be handled individually (I, 4).

The remaining two-thirds of the participants stand firmly for a definite socialization of the economic structure, though thirty-nine believe that satisfactory results can be obtained by stopping short of a full socialist order and leaving some scope for private business activity and initiative (I, 5). This is probably the most significant piece of testimony in the entire study. The fact that two-thirds of a group of leaders of this type endorse an economic system that can best be identified by the word "socialism" has deep meaning with respect to the probable direction of purposeful social change. It also suggests that there must be some defect or inadequacy in the movement formally calling itself socialism that prevents it from rallying to its support in a practical and effective way numerous individuals and elements that are in fundamental sympathy with it. The ideal is clearly far more commanding than the program. The attitudes expressed in this section should obviously be correlated with the views expressed in the Public Ownership section of the Action Proposals (II, C), where only thirty-two commit themselves to a full socialistic program.

It is also clear that this socialistically minded two-thirds lean strongly toward gradualism and constitutional procedure as contrasted with violent revolution, since fifty vote for Item I, 7 and forty-five for Item I, 10, while only four vote for I, 12. Yet the heavy vote—forty-eight—for Item I, 11 reveals a deep-seated fear that the resistance of the reactionary elements will prove so strong that violence will eventually break out. Just twice as many believe that true socialism involves the control of government by the working class as the reverse, though the question does not reveal whether this control is to emerge naturally because in a democratic state the numerical preponderance of workers over other classes automatically gives them control, or whether workers are to be definitely organized into a political power group.

It is striking that in this group of broad-minded leaders only seventeen (I, 17) take the extreme pacifist view of declaring all war unjustifiable. The shades of belief of the others are revealed in Section A of the Action Proposals. The outlook of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the group as a whole with reference to war is definitely pessimistic. The vote in favor of the impossibility of eliminating war except through world-wide socialism corresponds closely to the general socialistic representation. Only seventeen believe that it is possible to avoid war under the existing social order, while forty-six believe that the danger of war can be minimized.

Turning now to the Action Proposals, we find first of all a vote of seventy-four for the reduction of armaments by international agreement, which is impressive in the light of the virtual sterility of the recent efforts in this direction. The vote is much smaller for those measures (II, A, 2 and 3) that involve the identification and special treatment of an "aggressor," though forty clearly believe that an economic boycott is preferable to military participation in war. The question on public ownership of munitions plants is included in the section on war instead of in the general public-ownership section, and the vote of seventy-one should be highly encouraging to Senator Nye. The answers to Items II, A, 5 and 6 make it evident that the threat of territorial invasion is a factor of great importance in determining the justifiable attitude toward war. It is interesting that the vote in favor of pledges against war under any circumstances is four higher than that (I, 17) condemning all war.

Free trade gets a strong endorsement of sixty, while economic self-sufficiency polls a mere nineteen. The use of the general strike as a pacifist instrument appeals to slightly more than half.

The vote on social-security measures is almost unanimous, and indicates that whatever basic form of social system the participants prefer, they agree that some provision for security and emancipation from fear is an essential of any tolerable order in the present era of potential abundance. All five items are strongly endorsed; the slight decline in the vote for death (or life) insurance is probably due to the opinion that in a properly ordered society there would be sufficient provision for the survivors so that this type of insurance would be unnecessary.

The ban on child labor is also upheld almost unanimously. The comments of some of those who failed to endorse it indicate that the missing votes are due to the feeling that in a socially administered economy some work on the part of children might be beneficial from the educational or developmental point of view. More than half of the supporters favor an age limit of eighteen or over.

Items II, B, 3 and 4, broadly interpreted as they were meant to be, would automatically carry the support of the entire socialistic group, as they are integral to a completely socialized economy. The vote of seventy-five for public works and fifty-seven for wage-and-hour regulation indicates that a considerable proportion of the remainder regards these as either logical features of a partly socialistic society or as necessary improvements on a capitalistic system.

The vote of sixty-three on Item II, B, 5 is one of the most striking and significant features of the entire study. This is one of the most radical proposals in the questionnaire. While it is true that even under the existing order society theoretically provides a minimum standard of living for all its people in the sense that it does not deliberately allow any of them to starve, yet such provision is given in the name of charity, and the recipients are made to cringe and grovel for it and to endure a social stigma. The adoption of this guarantee as a part of the normal obligation of society toward its members is nothing short of revolutionary, and the fact that over two-thirds of this group endorse it should give the reactionaries considerable food for thought.

Under the Public Ownership heading the original intention was to arrange the items in the order of a steady leftward progression. This proved to be impossible, as the recorded votes testify. It would be difficult to determine which of these proposals was regarded as more radical than another. As the vote stands, the communication system seems to call most loudly for public ownership and administration, with underlying resources a close second. But if Items 6 and 7 are put together (they were really meant to be alternative choices, but the total vote of 120 shows that many participants did not so interpret them), the conclusion seems to be justified that there is greater support for a federal banking system of some sort than for any other single proposal. The total of forty-three votes for the public ownership and operation of all "basic industries" is significant not only for itself, but also as a revelation of the willingness of many participants to suppress their craving for precision and definition for the sake of registering their endorsement of a sound general principle.

Taking this section as a whole, the demand for the wide extension of public ownership and administration is unequivocal and impressive. While only thirty-two go the whole socialist way (II, C, 12) with an additional thirteen who would exempt productive land (II, C, 11), yet there is no doubt that the group as a whole expresses what must be a widespread popular recognition that the day of privately owned, competitive general business is over, and the only real question is how far and how fast public ownership should be extended. Of course, as already observed, a considerable number still prefer to rely on control and regulation, particularly of monopoly, while some regard public ownership as merely an impediment to genuine socialist advance. How elusive is the extrinsic dividing line between fascism and socialism is indicated by the fact that a leading exponent of the fascist view voted favorably for all of the public-ownership proposals except the last two.

The answers to Section D carry out the impression created by the replies on banking that this group recognizes the urgent necessity of a complete

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

renovation of our monetary and credit system. A federally owned and administered credit system is obviously closely linked with a federal banking system, and the votes in favor of Item II, D, 5 would probably have numbered more than forty-five had the question been less detailed and technical. Practically half of the participants are in favor of some monetary system that will recognize commodity purchasing power as the real basis of a stable currency, while only a beggarly five support the traditional fixed gold standard as a satisfactory monetary basis. The great majority favor reliance on heavily graduated income and inheritance and profit taxes as the main source for public revenue, while the small vote of ten on Item II, D, 2 indicates that the fundamental principles of the Henry George single-tax school do not command wide adherence.

In the Labor Relations section, the first feature to attract attention is that only one participant favors a complete hands-off policy and only five feel that compulsory arbitration is the answer. There is an obvious desire to improve the status of labor, as indicated by the large votes on Items 5 and 6. The preponderant rejection of company unions is of particular significance in the present state of the N.R.A. Important likewise, from the point of view of general labor organization, is the marked preponderance of approval of the majority-rule principle as contrasted with the minority rule in collective bargaining.

The two alternatives as to how to deal with problems of constitutionality divide the group almost evenly, although several participants voted for both. On the whole, it is clear that the group does not believe in allowing rigid constitutional limitations to impede desirable social readjustments.

The vote in favor of free speech is nearly unanimous, although ten would make an exception with respect to the opponents of free speech. The vote on the methods of opposing fascism progresses from a total of twenty-eight in favor of educational methods only through forty in favor of a general strike or mass action to a majority of forty-seven for violence if necessary.

The central message of this study stands out quite clearly. It *is* possible to get intelligent, conscientious, cautious people to express themselves positively on proposals for definite social action, and when they do express themselves, they display pronounced agreement. Practically all of them want social-security provisions, either as a part of a capitalistic or a socialistic economy; they all want child labor abolished as a means of livelihood; there is a vociferous demand for extensive public ownership and operation, particularly of munitions plants, and unequivocal rejection of a fixed gold standard. Free speech and a reasonable standard of living must be socially guaranteed, and the resources for governmental operation must be derived primarily from heavily graduated income, inheritance and profits taxes.

It must not be supposed that this fundamental agreement indicates complete uniformity of thinking on the part of the participants, or any lack of individual interpretations or specialized preferences. The letters and comments that accompany the returns abound in stimulating, thoughtful, constructive suggestions about the details of organization, structure or operation, all of which are worthy of careful consideration by those who might ever be charged with establishing the basic features indicated. Several valuable articles could be made out of a synthesis of these replies. One or two are virtually articles in themselves. The important thing is that agreement *can* be reached on fundamentals, and that two-thirds of those who reply display a willingness to concentrate on essentials, even at the sacrifice of some cherished preferences.

There should be important material here for the consideration of those who are concerned with the consolidation of the discontented and restive elements into an effective political instrument for social change. The ineffectiveness of parties or movements that insist upon an all-inclusive basic philosophy or ideology, and a comprehensive and inflexible program for detailed social reorganization, has been sufficiently demonstrated by the history of the past one hundred years. It is impossible to get a majority to agree on such a basis. In the preparation of this questionnaire the platforms of most of the important liberal and radical action groups were studied, and the essence of virtually all their definite and practical proposals was included in the questionnaire. A political party that built its platform upon the items that stand out in this study, if positively supported by the elements whose views are represented here, could sweep the country.

To anyone who believes that constructive social change must come through intelligent analysis, objective planning and concerted action, it seems imperative that Americans who are sincere in their desire for drastic social improvement should cultivate the spirit of compliance and renunciation. No one person can possibly draw up a detailed plan for social reorganization that will be entirely satisfactory to any other individual, to say nothing of a majority of his fellow citizens. We must cultivate a sense of fundamentals. We must learn the legitimate limits of a "principle." We must be able to perceive the line between conscience and concession. Only by these means is there the slightest hope of success. The agents of exploitation, greed and reaction understand this well enough. The sugar lobby manages to come to an agreement as to what it wants and how to go after it. Munitions makers are not hampered by too much squeamishness about ideologies in arranging their bargains with venal politicians. Corporation directors do not quibble too long about definitions of salary and bonus when it comes to splitting up a surplus.

There is no time for a meticulous adjustment and integration of every shade of academic and philosophic opinion. The surge of social change is rush-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing on. If it be true, as one college president suggests, that "many of the answers which you will receive will be merely statements of prejudices and predilections," it is no less true that the practical political forces that play through modern society are also based on prejudices and predilections. If we must be guided by prejudices and predilections, is it not better to rely on those of intelligent, thoughtful and socially minded individuals than on those of greedy exploiters and of the ignorant, credulous masses? If many of us, like one of the correspondents, are "revising our conclusions day by day," must we postpone action until all our conclusions are finally set and hardened, and we ourselves are thoroughly ossified? Can we afford to delay in this, while others less intellectually scrupulous control the situation and determine the direction of social movement?

This study shows that there is an army of liberal and progressive thinkers who are not guided merely by prejudices and predilections, and whose convictions, though probably undergoing some daily modifications, are nevertheless sufficiently confirmed and fortified to enable them to act sincerely with respect to concrete proposals. The time is crying for concerted, harmonious, well directed action on the part of such individuals. Will they be able to provide it? HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD.

Europe's Balance of Power

SUDDENLY, with a jerk, Europe in the month of March has realized the nature of the problem that confronts it. Can it adjust itself to a new balance of military power? That Hitler's avowal of his air force and proclamation of conscription should have startled the professional politicians, as it did, is an odd evidence of the lethargy of human imagination. What else did they expect? These things have been inevitable since the Nazis came to power. What was startling was, perhaps, not so much the disclosure of the fact that Germany is once again a great military Power, as the manner of the announcement—without a by your leave, or a promise or even a pretense of negotiation.

I cannot bring myself to share the general indignation. The chief of many follies perpetrated at Versailles was the attempt to obliterate German sovereignty. The conception of absolute national sovereignty is a relic of barbarism and the root of anarchy, but one does not abolish it by denying it to a single beaten people. Now sovereignty has no clearer mark than the right to arm at one's own discretion. One may argue and bargain with a sovereign state to limit or reduce its arms of its own free will: command it one cannot. Germany has recovered her sovereignty in the only possible way, by asserting it. Henceforth she no more seeks the permission of Britain and France to arm than they have ever sought hers. This is, no doubt, an alarming and portentous fact, but it may in the end be salutary, for it compels us to realize the nature of the anarchy amid which we choose to live.

During the first twelve years after the Versailles Treaty the phrase "balance of power" was obliterated from the vocabulary of daily life. This did not mean, as liberals fondly imagined, that we had outlived the idea by realizing at Geneva a new phase of civilization. Europe lived under a distribution of force so partial that no one could call it a balance. In the Old World, France and her allies were supreme on land and Britain at sea. One modification came imperceptibly: Italy provided herself with a new martial spirit and a bigger and better equipped army. About two years ago, much behind the times, first Paris and then London awakened to the fact that the Red Army is the biggest military machine on the earth's surface, though a great part of it will always be immobilized in the Far East. And now into this pattern we have to fit the new German power, much the biggest single unit in the West, probably the most up-to-date in its equipment, and backed by the most elaborate industrial system.

Instantly, in the presence of this new fact, the unstable balance begins to shift, but as yet one cannot say to what extent. Poland moves into the German orbit, but whether this *rapprochement* is an alliance, one is not sure. Italy, after balancing and bartering, is at length regarded by the French, if not as an ally, at least as a fairly reliable associate. It looks like an overwhelming balance against the Germans, so overwhelming that one could talk much more plausibly than in 1914 of "encirclement"—France, Russia, Italy and the Little Entente against Germany and perhaps Poland. It is hard at first sight to explain the nervousness of the French. Not even the doubt whether Hungary and Bulgaria will follow Italy in her new orientation, or adhere eventually to the German camp, can quite account for it. Greece was doubtful, until the Venizelists were smashed the other day. Austria will always be an anxiety, and to a less extent the German element in Czechoslovakia.

But the real enigma about this balance is whether one can reckon in terms of Continental Europe alone. Is Japan to be included in the German scale? And if so, where do the great sea Powers stand, Britain and the United States?

The business of adjusting, and if possible stabilizing, this new balance goes on under the novel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

technique of "regional pacts," a French invention. Paris and London have in effect discarded the League of Nations. At the recent meetings of its committee that watches the Chaco war with impotent disapproval, the French delegate shook his finger with an air of superiority at the South American Republics and said in effect: "What can one do with people who lack the sense to conclude a regional pact?" The device is workable when one can associate together sated Powers, big or small, that are satisfied with the status quo and their own place in the sun. Then there is a common interest to defend, and a mutual pledge against aggression can be given and observed with complete sincerity.

If the affairs of the West could be isolated from those of the East, the Locarno Treaty and the proposed air pact that is to pledge Britain, France and Germany to mutual defense in this element would be a perfectly rational conception. For Hitler has repeated, it may be sincerely, what the Republican regime said before him: he accepts the Western frontier without regret or the wish to alter it. Unfortunately, one cannot localize peace in this way. If ever the bombing planes do get to work across these Western frontiers, it will not be any local quarrel that sets them flying: it may be the affairs of the Ukraine or of Timbuctoo. But whatever occasion leads to the attack, the issue will be, broadly, world power and the right to dictate.

The other pacts that the French, with Italian and Russian aid, have obligingly prepared for Herr Hitler's signature are even more obviously exposed to this criticism. Either the Central European pact, which guarantees what is quaintly called Austria's independence, is a meaningless diplomatic technicality that anyone may interpret as he pleases, or else it means that Germans renounce forever all hope of union with Austria, and are content that it should remain, what it is today, an Italian dependency. If it be the former, it is a waste of good ink; if the latter, then the Germans will sign it only when they are beaten and cowed and helpless.

The German, and still more the Polish, objection to the Eastern Pact is rather more elusive. Why should the Poles, a sated, even a gorged Power, object to stereotyping the present distribution of territory in the East? Germany, indeed, has claims she need not be ashamed to avow, but these lie against Poland, and with that neighbor she has a ten-year pact that binds her hands already. Is the real objection, as Berlin and Warsaw say, that they doubt the use of overambitious multilateral pacts, and cannot pledge themselves to go to all their neighbors' defense? Is it that they dislike the idea of being dragged passive in the wake of a Franco-Russian initiative, and morally coerced to sign a document of which the inner meaning, whatever the form, is certainly that Moscow and Paris are once more virtually allies? Why should France, which has no territory or interests in the East, appear as the "guarantor" (whatever that may mean) of an Eastern Pact? This line of thought sufficiently accounts for the German attitude towards this particular proposal. But one may suspect a more sinister motive. Are Warsaw and Berlin speculating on the chances of a conveniently timed rising in the Ukraine, or of disturbances in the Baltic States? Both of them have in these regions their subsidized partisans. Those who have read "Mein Kampf" in the original incline to this last explanation.

On a detailed survey, then, this French expedient of the regional pact looks hardly more hopeful than the general Covenant of the League. It is an attempt to sterilize military power so that eventually its owners shall agree to limit and even to reduce it, as a mere purposeless waste of their resources. That may seem an aim deserving of support. But it breaks on the same rock as the League's Covenant. It stabilizes a status quo achieved by no means more respectable than that superiority in armed power which the Allies attained in 1918. The League never faced the problem of revision and peaceful change; and there is no provision for it in these pacts. We are told that the Allies did eventually drop reparations—but, only in face of the physical impossibility of exacting them. They also conceded military equality "in principle"—but only after the Germans had already defiantly begun to rearm. The concept of "aggression" has no meaning for morals when the peaceful Powers are merely sated Powers sitting tight on gains they won by their hunger-blockade.

What, then, is the prospect? That the Germans will refuse to have their hands tied, that they will go on methodically accumulating armed power and attracting allies, while they use their new prestige from time to time to snatch something they want? There is no obviously proper measure that can be applied to their armaments. It is naïve to suggest that all the Great Powers should have an approximately equal armed strength. That is to ignore alliances. And if you ask a German why he must have a bigger army than the French, he can point to Russia's 900,000 men. Nor will it be easy for Hitler to stop at any fixed limit while the world remains in its present economic plight; for when he stops, he not only faces a new army of the unemployed but he leaves his real master, the heavy industry of the Ruhr, disconsolate. Neither in pacts nor in the arbitrary arithmetic of limitation is there the hope of an easy solution. And sooner or later, though he may have no wish for war, he will by this method miscalculate. One day he will snatch too much for Europe's nerves, and the doubtful balance will be tested on the battlefield.

Ideally, in a mood of liberal optimism, one could sketch out a possible solution. What do Germans want, and how much of it, literally or by substitutes, could Europe afford to concede? First, one supposes, they want to abolish the demilitarized zone, and this, before long, they will probably do without permission. Second, there is Austria. Its population might conceivably show a majority in their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favor: certainly there is no majority for the present inglorious type of fascism. Socialists and even Jews are so unhappy today that a Nazi regime could hardly be worse. Yet one cannot conceive that either Rome or Paris would tolerate a plebiscite, even if an honest vote could be guaranteed.

Finally and chiefly there is the economic problem. Hitler's solution of expansion at Russia's expense is a criminal day-dream that one need not discuss. The restoration of overseas colonies may be a more legitimate demand, but it would do little to ease the problem, even if London and Paris could be moved to an unlikely generosity. Furthermore, there is the possibility of an international policy of credit expansion, combined with public works on a great scale. If we shudder at the spectacle of this monstrous, inflated Ruhr industry making cannon and tanks, can we combine to employ it to make plows and rails and bridges instead, for China or South America or even for the Ukraine? That, indeed, might meet the difficulty. But who dares predict that we can on a world scale solve the problem of a planned society that baffles each of us at home? The anarchy that reveals itself in rival squadrons of bombing planes is in the last analysis economic.

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

Two Sonnets

I

Strange fires have shaped our people: let this be
Hushed on the tongue; see that no eye shall trace
Its ravage on the brow . . . yet memory
Shall not again grow green above the place,
The sear, in spirit, that may no more spring
In growths of innocence than may this bough—
Of whose scarred wood no prescient March shall sting
The sap awake—put forth in leafage now.

No sprig is left, for all your nimble pains,
O scavengers, but fireweed like a blood,
In pale dilution, blent with April rains
That beat upon it, mantling the sod
Beneath this tree (it was a beech by choice)
Where Africa cried out with a great voice.

II

Extend the circle about thee and me,
Spanning abysses; though the heart approve
Its closed horizon and the body be
Pleasured and couched in felicity
For its provendered days, be free of love
(Knowing the path between me and thee . . .
And no way but this) for the spirit's trove.

Who loves must bind and be, with the one chain,
Linked to the dear possession: Jesus knew
This . . . and Siddârtha who went forth alone,
From the sweet-smelling bed where he had lain,
Bare-footed into the bare dawn, and grew
Toward larger ends of love in loving none.

LOLA RIDGE.

Washington Notes

Fisherman's Return—Money's the Main Thing—More Trimming for the Eagle—The Wagner Bill and the Bonus

THERE seems fairly good reason to believe that when the President returns from his vacation on the Astor yacht, he will find things, so far as Congress is concerned, pretty much as he left them. This will be an improvement over what happened last year, when he had hardly left for his fishing trip before the Senate passed over his veto the independent-offices bill, with some $110,000,000 therein of which he disapproved. This cannot happen again because no veto has been left behind, and the issue on which a veto might be overridden—to wit, the bonus—will not come to a head until after he is back in the White House.

It does seem that with the multitudinous and variegated program he left behind him the administration leaders in House and Senate could make a little more progress than they give evidence of doing. It is, of course, certain that the five-billion-dollar work-relief bill will be ready for his signature, but it had already been put over the worst hurdles before he left. Legislation that will not be advanced to a state where its passage in acceptable form can be regarded as assured includes the social-security bill, the N.R.A. life-extension act, the holding-company bill, the new banking bill and the amendments to the A.A.A. that are so ardently desired by Mr. Chester Davis. The administration has placed itself solidly behind all these measures. Mr. Roosevelt communicated his desire for their passage on a "must" schedule to Leader Robinson of Arkansas in a last-minute White House conference. Yet I shall be greatly surprised indeed if Mr. Roosevelt finds any of them in conference committee when he returns.

It now becomes clear that the work-relief bill was loaded down with various amendments considered undesirable and calculated to cramp its operation. The idea that they could all be eliminated in conference has been proved to be an erroneous one, and it is known that the President is somewhat disappointed. Evidence of this has come from both Mr. Ickes and Mr. Hopkins. However, despite the somewhat embarrassing modifications, the main thing was to get the money, and that he has. As I write, the specific set-up for the work-relief bill is not yet revealed in detail, but enough is known now to make it reasonably sure that Mr. Hopkins will be the dominant figure on the relief end, and it is said that Mr. Ickes' part will be considerably less prominent than he had expected. However, my information is that Mr. Ickes had a complete understanding with Mr. Roosevelt on the subject of the new program and is in entire accord with his position therein.

The most controversial feature of the remaining days of the session, leaving out the bonus, is the N.R.A. bill, unexpectedly presented to the Senate last week by Senator Harrison and supposedly drafted by Mr. Donald Richberg. It is understood to represent Mr. Roosevelt's—and Mr. Richberg's—idea of the form in which the N.R.A. should be extended. It is also understood that Mr. Richberg went over the main provisions of the bill with Mr. William

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Green and Mr. John Lewis, and that it has their support, largely because the part dealing with Section 7a is to their liking. With the labor endorsement added to the administration pressure, one would think it relatively easy to obtain speedy enactment of this proposal. That, however, would be a very mistaken idea. As things stand in the Senate today, the odds are quite heavy against the N.R.A. bill's going through in anything like its present form. The best evidence of this is the vigorous comment upon the measure made by Senator Borah. "I should," he said, "be very greatly surprised if so incoherent, confused and contradictory a bill as this can be enacted at this session."

The opposition to the N.R.A. bill comes from so many different quarters that actually it is amusing. Mr. Borah, for example, is a progressive Republican, but he is not more emphatically against the N.R.A., though for different reasons, than that most regular of old-fashioned Democrats, Senator Carter Glass of Virginia. Senator Glass, it will be recalled, nearly two years ago told General Johnson, "You cannot put your bird of prey on my newspaper," and challenged him to do something about it. The General not only did nothing about it, but never tried to do anything, though those were the halcyon days when he was threatening to crack down on Henry Ford.

One piece of legislation whose prospects have brightened in the past week is the Wagner labor-board bill. A few weeks ago its chances of passing seemed slim indeed, largely because of the hostile attitude of the administration. Industrial leaders were up in arms about the bill and their attitude had been reflected by Mr. Richberg, who declared himself opposed to it. Just before Mr. Roosevelt sailed, Messrs. Green, Lewis and Richberg attended a White House conference, after which the Messrs. Green and Lewis said they were reconciled to Mr. Richberg's holding the temporary chairmanship of the N.R.A. Board and lined up with the President for legislation continuing the existence of the organization. Mr. Richberg, in his turn, declared that he favored the "principles" of the Wagner bill. While Mr. Roosevelt thus avoided taking a personal position, the understanding in labor circles was that his hostility to the Wagner bill had vanished and he would interpose no obstacles to its passage—certainly not a veto.

The bill cannot go through without a stiff fight and it may be beaten, because the forces against it are strong and determined. It is significant, I think, that notwithstanding the deeply controversial nature of this and the highly important character of other measures now pending, interest both in and out of Congress is far greater in the bonus proposal than in anything else. It is interesting, too, that the opinion of those who know most about the Senate situation is that the American Legion bill—not the Patman bill, passed by the House—will go through the Senate. There is also considerable private conviction that there will be enough votes to pass it over the presidential veto.

Privately, there is an intimation that when the President fully realizes the situation in the Senate, he will not want to go to a finish fight on that issue, but will be receptive to some form of compromise along the lines of the Tydings bill. It seems to me that he would be better advised to go down fighting.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Revolution in Wall Street—The Blunders of Mr. Whitney—The Waning Morgan Star—News for Commission Brokers

REVOLUTION, and successful revolution at that, has invaded the last stronghold of orthodoxy—the New York Stock Exchange. The nominating committee has turned Mr. Richard Whitney down for reëlection as president and put forward instead Mr. Charles R. Gay, senior partner of Whitehouse and Company. It was only a palace revolution, of course, but a successful one.

The Exchange has done well. The most defunct chair-warmer at the Union League Club, looking at the world over his gold spectacles, is prepared to admit that the scene he beholds is a vastly altered one. Mr. Whitney, it must be freely admitted, fought energetically and bravely for the Exchange in a period of peculiar difficulties. But he was fighting for his order, and that order draws near its allotted time. It was his misfortune and the misfortune of the Exchange that the events of the last five years had made so little impression. The man, in a disintegrating system, tried to save everything. His policy was wrong; his implements were even more ineptly chosen.

I recall the beginning of the investigation of the Stock Exchange. As the representative of Mr. Pecora, it fell to my lot to hold a series of conferences with Mr. Whitney and his counsel. We had prepared a questionnaire to the Exchange and another to be sent to members by the Exchange. This latter was designed to develop information about the practices of brokers, their personal trading, the pools they shared in, their earnings, their use of bank funds and a great variety of other facts. They were absolutely essential to any intelligent consideration of the economic significance of speculation and the means to be adopted to deal with the problem.

What is more, the United States Senate Committee had the most extensive powers to go into the Exchange and the offices of its members and get the facts or to summon all the brokers down to Washington with their books. There was really no way to escape this study. A wise general would have made a virtue of necessity and made a liberal gesture of complete willingness to coöperate. The Senate Committee had met little or no resistance from the banks in their efforts to get data. Indeed, the banks had made quite welcome the investigators who toiled a whole summer in the National City and the Chase raking through the banks' books. Feeling against the Stock Exchange was very strong. A shrewd counsellor would have taken note of this important fact. I was therefore surprised when I found Mr. Whitney interposing difficulties at every turn and finally flatly refusing to send out the questionnaire to his members, taking refuge in a purely legal technicality.

What went on in those conferences I shall not go into here. But when I left I found myself in a state of amazement that there could be left in America two men in a position of leadership who had sensed so little the temper of the times and the changes that had been made in their own world. Neither of these men—I refer to Mr. Whitney and his attorney—lacks intelligence. Yet both imagined

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in 1933 they could say to the Senators of an aroused country which, rightly or wrongly, believed that Wall Street had undone them, that the Exchange was a private club, that they would stand on their rights, that they would maintain their old secrecy about their affairs and that the Committee would just have to worry along somehow.

I had had many contacts with the public-relations machinery of the Exchange. Though I had always been a critic, I had been treated with the greatest courtesy. I believe that the work done, for instance, by the public-relations agencies of the Exchange in the days preceding the crash was most intelligent. I had seen much of Mr. Jason Westerfield, who had so large a hand in it. He is a gentleman of the most amiable and ingratiating qualities who sold the Exchange around the country with rare good judgment. But after the crash and the rise of Mr. Whitney to power, after the long series of disasters in finance, the banking collapse, the flight of the industrial kings, the discrediting of business, the scandals unearthed by the banking committee of the Senate—this was a time, if ever, for the most adroit and tactful policy in the management of the public and legislative relations of the institution.

A very good job was done in raising a wind against the Exchange bill after it was introduced. Immense and violent propaganda all over the country was directed against the measure. But all the while the impression was left with the Senate committee that the Exchange could be depended on to resist to the last gasp all efforts to reform it.

What has happened since the Commission was set up need not be gone into. For my part, I think Mr. Whitney may well congratulate himself that he is out of the mess. We have probably not heard the end of it.

The new regime may mean two things. One, that the influence of the Morgan firm, so long dominant in the affairs of its great neighbor, is on the wane. The other is a lessening of the floor traders' influence and the emergence of the commission houses in the government of the Exchange. During the discussion preceding the introduction of the exchange bill and while it was being prepared, there was much talk about banning floor traders from the Exchange altogether. I favored that. Many others did. But this was a very serious piece of news in Wall Street for it was the floor trader and specialist element—the gambling element on the Exchange—that had controlled its destinies and made its rules. Some commission brokers favored the curtailment of the floor trader's privilege. Many more favored the reduction of his influence in the government of the body. Some of the floor traders were quite peeved at this—at what they regarded as the pernicious activity of some of the commission houses.

Just about this time my telephone rang. On the other end was a gentleman who was an important figure in Wall Street and represented some very powerful interests. He said: "If you fellows want to put something in that bill which will strike at a pretty bad crowd down here in the Street, why don't you put in a provision absolutely forbidding any stock-brokerage firm from having more than one office. Put an end to the wire houses." Then he proceeded to make a very earnest argument on that point. It will be news to the commission brokers that some of their friends were trying to put them out of business.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Not So Deep as a Well . . .

PRIVATE WORLDS" is a surprisingly good thing for Hollywood to be making from a novel like Phyllis Bottome's, which is much too inward to be picked up by the cameras, and which might therefore have been replaced by some such convenient pattern as that of passions practised between, say, Fredric March and Norma Shearer, the theme tune being, Private Worlds, I Love You. The original story has been simplified, heightened as to coloring and made more compact; but it has been turned into a movie that runs off with less of flash than of dignity and honest intelligence.

Here and there in the film matters go noticeably wrong. The part of the matron is plugged too hard, and there are several spots where a patient is restored to calm in too much of a jiffy for total credence. Joel McCrea is miscast, and though Claudette Colbert is one of the few young women who could even be considered for the part, with brains and a good style of her own, she confuses a few basic meanings by sticking too close to herself—here she is to be found reading lines that would indicate a cold, controlled personality, and yet simply radiating her own charming come-ons from start to finish.

These things do not seem to be right, but in general the management is so good as to cover up the fact that such a story—a combination of brash exterior action with extensive clinical explorations—is simply too complicated for the screen to handle properly. The action in the movie culminates in the young wife's accident, and therefore has to taper off shortly thereafter, making the end a little unreal. Nevertheless this whole way of doing it seems to have been about the shrewdest, given the book, because at such a point it can be carried off on the backwash of the scene where the girl, having all along harbored a morbid fascination for the parallel existing between her case and that of poor Carrie Flint, goes out of her head one stormy night, hears voices and jumps from the stairs.

We can only imagine what a headache a scene like this must be by taking it from the point of view of director La Cava, holding the mere script and wondering what the hell to do with everybody. Shall the girl go up the stairs, sweeping along like Ann Harding, and take the header clutching at her bodice? Shall she roll her eyes and paint furrows in her cheeks and clutch rabidly at banisters, as in a Boris Karloff? Or shall we just have her standing at the top, tragic like Kay Francis, and cut to her lying with tragic grace at the bottom in a completely new and different creation by Adrian?

In the actual picture this scene starts ordinarily enough, with the young wife (Joan Bennett) alone in the house, and the library recording for thunder-outside on the sound-track. Then she goes to the window, hearing a voice call her by name, Sally, Sally, in key with the music, which has started up; and although this musical twist is not at first convincing, as she starts for the stairs the whole thing is made completely eerie by distortion of sound, echoes and overtones, and there are heard directly several lines from a former scene with the crazy girl—"I'm Carrie Flint, I've come to tea, I'm Carrie Flint"—blurring and echoing, the music rising. Through here the camera is twisted on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its axis through several different planes: the girl gets to the top of the stairs in this shifting unstable state, and jumps finally towards the voice, going down and out of the camera, which remains on the empty landing until the fall is over, and the next sequence elsewhere is cut in. This bit is the most effective thing in the picture; but it is more important as an illustration of something very necessary to any consideration of pictures as a whole: namely, that the superficial realism of photography and sound recording can be extended just as infinitely into the irreality of illusion as the medium of any other art.

All of which leaves little space for mention of the clear line of action into which the separate parts of the picture were fitted, and of the restrained naturalism with which these separate parts, especially the background scenes of dementia, were put on. Or for the central figure of the whole production, Charles Boyer—a man with not only unmistakable personal force, but sufficient artistic command to turn it into almost any part as a strong and convincing current. And Helen Vinson, as the rather odd sister, shows a capability that might well have earned her a bigger role. It is clear that she is not playing a type part, but one she has thought out for herself, studying what details of motion, under what central control, will build her own personal qualities into a character in a story, for whom certain actions have been devised, to whom has been left the responsibility for squaring these actions with some believable, separate personality. This care and intelligent foresight is more or less characteristic of the picture as a whole—it is a good, grown-up job on a difficult theme, and thus in the long run a more cheering spectacle than most of the pictures that have come out this year, though there have been several of more drive and beauty. And with such family films as R.K.O.'s "Laddie" trembling somewhere under the release-horizon, it is quite welcome as a corrective to certain unescapable though temporary presentiments that we are growing into, rather than out of, diapers.

OTIS FERGUSON.

To Make the Punishment Fit the Crime

"The government insists that he [John Strachey] stay here, at great personal inconvenience and expense, until it has decided whether to force him to return to his home—which is all that he wants to do in any case. Gilbert and Sullivan might have done justice to this situation; we cannot."—The New Republic, April 3.

SCENE: A COURTROOM

ATTORNEYS, JURYMEN, HOI POLLOI and a LARGE PUBLISHER discovered as the curtain rises, together with a mixed chorus of D.A.R. MEMBERS and AMERICAN LEGIONNAIRES.]

CHORUS:

Hark, the hour of ten is sounding!
Hearts with anxious fears are bounding;
Court of Justice crowds surrounding,
Breathing hope and fear—
For today in this arena,
Summoned by a stern subpoena
Issued out in Pasadena,
STRACHEY will appear!

[*As the JURY is being marshaled into the box, the LARGE PUBLISHER faces them, and striking an attitude, sings:*]

I pray you men to free your mind
Of prejudice and bias,
Ere you proceed to penalize
This vicious Ananias
Who plans by stealth to seize the wealth
Of common folk like we, men—
So clear your mind of bias blind
And show us that you're he-men.

CHORUS of D.A.R.'S AND LEGIONNAIRES:

Yes, yes!
From bias free, his doom decree
Like twelve red-blooded he-men!

[*Flourish of trumpets. Enter, four HUSKIES, ushering in JOHN STRACHEY bound in heavy chains made out of red tape.*]

HUSKIES:

We caught him at the steamship pier
Attempting to escape—

CHORUS OF D.A.R.'S AND LEGIONNAIRES:

This alien here was at the pier,
Attempting to escape!

HUSKIES:

We caught him though, we caught St. Loe,
We snared him in red tape!

[*The prisoner leans heavily on a chair and sings:*]

Was ever a mortal so chivied and cursed
By muddled legislation?
Who is this protean publisher
That stultifies a nation?

[*JUDGE pounds gavel and sings:*]

Order in court! Prisoner at the bar—
Evelyn John St. Loe Strachey
Your bold attempts to flee this country are
Evidence you're guilty—*prima facie!*

[*Thumbs through an old law book. Then, peering over his eye-glasses, he recites:*]

No gentleman would overthrow
Our status cow, our sacred quo—
We tolerate no revolution
Or changes in our Constitution.
We tell our people how to think
By drowning them in printers' ink.

[*Nods to PUBLISHER who bows*]

Though we will always welcome an honest opportunist
Never will we countenance a radical Communist!

CHORUS OF D.A.R.'S AND LEGIONNAIRES:

Never, never, never any nasty old Communist!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STRACHEY [rising]
If that's the case, I'll go—

ALL:
No, no!

STRACHEY:
Then if you wish, I'll stay—

ALL:
Nay, Nay!

STRACHEY:
Go not—nor stay—?
Ah, well-a-day!

JUDGE:
Silence! Order! Here's the jury—
Gentlemen, proclaim your fury.

FOREMAN of JURY:
Because he is an English neighbor,
We give him ten years at hard labor!

STRACHEY:
Ten years hard labor?

ALL:
Ten years hard labor
Because you are an English neighbor!

THE LARGE PUBLISHER:
The sentence brings a glow of pride
To my delighted breast;
—But, all my private joy aside,
I fear I must protest;

CHORUS of ALL
He fears he must protest!

PUBLISHER:
With unemployment in our land
And idle men on every hand—
Yes, scores of them, I understand,
Throughout our noble nation,
It seems a rather heinous sin
To let cheap foreign labor in—
It would at best be but a thin
And trashy imitation!

ALL:
How very true!
Without a doubt!
We'll keep cheap foreign labor out!

JUDGE:
Okay, hey nonny, nonny no!
We'll let the British product go—

[*Turns and looks for STRACHEY who has vanished. A stuffed white dove is lowered from the flies as the music strikes up an anthem.*]

MAURICE SAGOFF.

CORRESPONDENCE

Good News for Taxpayers

SIR: After reading Stuart Chase's "Old Man River" [The New Republic, March 27], my excited friends and I want to know why the subject of this article has not received wide publicity. Is there anything more important in the country?

Mr. Chase points out that the spending of President Roosevelt's $4,880,000,000 offers us an opportunity we will never have again to kill with one stone our largest birds of prey. The money will be spent substantially to save from erosion and flood the great Central Valley where our staple crops grow; to save 49,000,000 people who live in this valley and who are dependent upon it for their existence; and to preserve the taxpayer who would otherwise miss, sooner than he cares to admit, his wheat, corn, cotton, rye, hogs, beeves, coal, iron ore, copper, oil.

And it is the unemployed who will carry out this program. Thus the excuse for spending this enormous sum becomes almost incidental. And yet this is the first relief work we have that is permanent and constructive rather than palliative; and, further, it is relief that will not interfere with normal industry.

An amazing situation, in which the taxpayer, in many ways, receives as much relief as the "man on relief." Is there a single taxpayer in the country who would not rejoice to hear this? Can't you persuade the President to broadcast the real significance of his "relief program"?

New York City. EMILY BEDFORD.

Hearst's Campaign Against Professors

SIR: Since William Randolph Hearst has publicly demanded that I be dismissed from my academic post, I wish to make public the following sequence of events, which will prove illuminating to all interested in the tactics of the Hearst press.

On November 14, 1934, The Chicago Herald-Examiner published a report of a meeting of the University of Chicago Student Union Against War and Fascism, in which I, as well as several other people, were grossly misquoted. In a letter to the editor, Mr. Watson, I protested against this misrepresentation and incidentally called attention to the fact that the alleged quotation from Lenin on the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was then appearing at the top of the editorial pages of all the Hearst papers, was nowhere to be found in Lenin's writings. Mr. Watson sent my protest to Mr. Hearst, who asked Mr. Charles Wheeler of The Herald-Examiner to "investigate." I received Mr. Wheeler in the presence of a third person and was shown material from his files showing conclusively that I had been "accidentally" misquoted—a fact Mr. Wheeler blandly conceded. He also conceded that the Lenin "quotation" was pure invention. "We just do what the Old Man orders. One week he orders a campaign against rats. The next week he orders a campaign against dope-peddlers. Pretty soon he's going to campaign against college professors. It's all the bunk, but orders are orders."

Shortly afterwards a New York anti-Nazi group requested me to prepare a series of replies to the syndicated articles by Goering appearing periodically in the Sunday issues of the Hearst papers. The International News Service (Hearst) encouraged the group to believe that an opportunity would be given for such replies. Two articles were submitted. Both were refused. . . . Meanwhile the "campaign against professors" materialized. On February 23 I delivered an address on "Communism and Liberalism" before the Cook County League of Women Voters in which I traced the historical relationship between the two ideologies, quoted with approval the Declaration of Independence and made a plea for a new liberalism adequate to the exigencies of today. Mr. Charles Wheeler attended the lecture. In The Herald-Examiner of February 24 it was reported under the headline: "HOPE LIES IN SOVIETS, U. of C. TEACHER SAYS; DECRIES LIBERALISM OF WASHINGTON." The article contained numerous statements in quotation marks that were purely products of Mr. Wheeler's imagination. In the same issue all the Hearst papers throughout the nation editorially condemned a number of educators as "advisers to Moscow" and "authorized disseminators of communistic propaganda in the United States who deliberately and designedly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mislead our fine young people and bring them up to be disloyal to our American ideals and institutions and stupidly to favor the brutal and bloody tyranny of Soviet Russia." The victims of this slanderous attack were all persons who have publicly criticized the Nazi regime in Germany. They included Robert M. Hutchins, Charles H. Judd, John Dewey, George S. Counts, Hallie Flanagan, Susan Kingsbury, I. L. Kandel, William F. Russell, Henry Pratt Fairchild, Frank P. Graham, Howard Odum, *et al.*

On March 16, 1935, The Herald-Examiner—with Hearst papers elsewhere copying—published an editorial, "Schuman of Chicago," which took out of their contexts two of Mr. Wheeler's misquotations and presented them as evidence that I am making a "direct challenge to American institutions in the name of communism." I was further accused of having "just written a book on Russia which has been approved by Moscow." (I have never written a book on Russia. My doctoral dissertation, "American Policy toward Russia Since 1917," was published in 1928 and was rejected for translation by Gosizdat, the Moscow State Publishing House, because it was not written from the Communist viewpoint.) The editorial described me as one of "these American panderers and trap-baiters for the Moscow mafia" who should be investigated by Congress and "gotten rid of" as a "Red."

This is but one of numerous instances of slanderous and libelous attacks upon American educators in the Hearst press. This strategy is exactly comparable to that of the Nazi press in Germany between 1920 and 1933. . . . If American universities and colleges are to be spared the fate that has befallen such institutions in Germany, if American scholars and educators are to be protected from Fascist bludgeoning of this type, if American traditions of freedom are to survive, Mr. Hearst must be recognized as the propagandist and forerunner of American Hitlerism and must be met with a united counter-attack by all Americans who still value their liberties.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN,
Assistant Professor of Political Science.
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The Twentieth Century Fund Report

SIR: In your editorial of March 13 commenting on the Twentieth Century Fund's program for federal labor legislation you oppose the recommendation that it be made illegal "for anyone to intimidate or coerce employees in the free exercise of their right to organize and to choose their own representatives." Such a prohibition, you argue, "would be used as a club to prevent independent unions from enrolling the workers in a plant against the will of the employer." "All the latter would need to do," you say, "would be to go to the nearest judge and declare his workers were being coerced." This is a serious misconception, as a careful reading of the Committee's recommendations will disclose.

This recommendation of the committee was designed to prevent the use of violence in what might be called industrial suffrage—the organizing of collective-bargaining agencies and the election of the representatives. These, the Committee makes perfectly clear, are exclusively *employees'* activities in which the employers should be prohibited by the federal labor law from playing any part whatever—by violence, discrimination, financial pressure or otherwise. No employer would have any standing in the hypothetical case you mention. From the Committee's point of view it is none of his business whether his employees are organizing or how they are being organized. If, however, one of his employees were attacked by a communist union leader because he promoted an A.F. of L. union in the shop—or if an employee were beaten up by an A.F. of L. organizer because he tried to organize a plant union—then the aggrieved employee could invoke the protection of the law.

Furthermore, "the nearest judge" would have no jurisdiction in your hypothetical case. The Committee would give original jurisdiction and enforcement powers, under the labor law, not to the courts, but to the Federal Labor Commission. The "nearest judge" would have jurisdiction only if the Commission's orders were not obeyed and the Commission itself brought the case into court.

I will admit that the phrase "intimidate or coerce" is too loose. It is the use of fraud and violence in industrial elections, and the preliminaries thereto, that the Committee seeks to restrain. This is made clear and specific in the amendments to the Wagner bill that the Committee proposes. The Committee's primary object has been, not to restrain, but to protect the organizing activities of labor through democratic methods.

EVANS CLARK, Director,
New York City. Twentieth Century Fund, Inc.

[We welcome this statement by the Director of the Twentieth Century Fund as to the attitude of its special committee that has been studying the relation between government and the labor problems of private industry, and we are particularly glad to see the admission that the phrase "intimidate or coerce" is too loose. We still feel, however, that the committee's recommendations, if carried out, would constitute a serious threat to the right of free collective bargaining. An employer would not need to go directly to court and declare that his workers were being coerced. He could easily bring pressure to bear upon certain individual workers to make such an appeal, ostensibly on their own behalf, and could finance them in doing so. It is interesting to note that the company union of the Duquesne plant of the United States Steel Corporation tied the hands of the Steel Labor Relations Board by obtaining an injunction when the Board ordered an election at that plant. There is no direct evidence to prove that the company or its agents are financing the suit. It is known, however, that the company union has no funds of any consequence, that the workers in its membership are poor, and that they are being represented by a firm of lawyers often retained in the past by the steel interests.

The argument that "this recommendation of the committee was designed to prevent the use of violence" is reminiscent of the phraseology of employers wishing to hamstring labor. Spokesmen for the workers have often pointed out that violence is already illegal and that the courts have interpreted 'intimidation and coercion" to mean more than physical violence. It is important to recall how often court decisions in the past have strained the language of the law, in such cases, for instance, as the interpretation of the Sherman Act, to the disadvantage of the workers. We feel that the Twentieth Century Fund Committee ought to demonstrate its good faith either by omitting this clause entirely or by inserting the word "employer" instead of the word "anyone." There is an excellent precedent for this in the language of the Railway Labor Act, which says unequivocally that "it shall be unlawful for any carrier . . . to influence or coerce employees in an effort to induce them to join or remain or not to join or remain members of any labor organization." Why should not this committee use equally clear and simple language?—THE EDITORS.]

Extracts from Letters

THE Office Workers' Union writes as follows regarding the strike of Wall Street employees: "On Friday, March 15, 1935, the New York Curb Exchange summarily discharged twenty-five employees, due, it was announced, to the fact that there was a lack of business activity. . . . This discharged group was employed all over the trading floor. The largest number, twelve, was stationed in the bond section. In this division, business exceeded all records in 1934 and thus far in 1935 has maintained its pace. These men individually had excellent records and were hardly the logical ones to be selected for dismissal should business have warranted it. . . . In view of this fact we investigated to find cause for the collective discharge. The only reason we found was their membership and general activity in the Wall Street Section of the Office Workers' Union. . . . This latest attempt to prevent men from exercising their right to organize is a direct attack upon all liberal-minded people. The white-collar union movements needs the support of everyone who holds to the basic principle of the right of men to organize. Needless to say, we will appreciate any financial support your readers might care to give. Contributions should be sent to William I. Landau, care of the Office Workers' Union, 504 Sixth Avenue, New York City."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of Blackest Midnight Born

Black Pit, by Albert Maltz. Civic Repertory Theatre, March 25, 1935.

MY POOR little title does suggest Milton, who had some ideas of human rights but had not heard of unions and capital. Nevertheless the title insinuates the one-sidedness of "Black Pit." What devils are sublimated into that coal-mine boss, Preston; and what millenniums will follow the strike, just-strike-knock-down-the-capitalists-and-all-that, I am not wholly scheduled to relate. What should follow after the workers' union, not the company's union, has got control is certainly not predicted by the dirty windows of those ladies of the mining "patch." With menages, shall we say, comparatively small, they could find time to wash their windows, which in the play at least, are dramatically foul. Or for the moment it may be some theatrical enthusiasm that makes them leave holes in the legs of their stockings. Yet I have seen peon Mexicans, sleeping on mats, in one room to a score of them (which, if you like, is snappy social data), and meanwhile the place is immaculate. There is a dirt floor, beaten hard, there are a few flowers at the door, a sense of keeping feminine hair clean and shapely, formal and decent—*decenza* as the degenerate Italians use the word. This means that a certain front to life, a certain social sense, is bound up with the comfort, or possibility, of one's existence at all. Is it possible to say that, if you happen to be in a country, or even of a race, somewhat overeasily sordid and tasteless, it takes a lot of income—a "fair income"—to slick you up?

I have seen from the train, in diverse spots—Arkansas at its worst, or Oklahoma at its worst—women sitting on afternoon porches with their hair still in a snarl. They have, perhaps, baked a hoe-cake during the day, fried some pork or boiled some collards, and there must have been, therefore, a fraction of a second when their hair could have been combed up into a decent knot at least. For dramatic purposes, however, we may agree that but for capitalism there would be a *soignée* wife in every home.

In such levitous comments, I am trying to say, first, that it is fun, theatrically and humanly, to be rash and total; and second, that I wonder whether a group of union theatrical workers would really prefer a critic talking thus seriously of their artistic venture, or would rather have a riproaring narrative of their amazing drama, their wow of a success, their thrilling, et cetera et cetera, new production. Yet, I know there are sure to be some in the Union that would like straight talking.

"Black Pit" is good lively melodrama. The mine manager is the villain, the rest is virtue in its various forms, with effective bits to round it off. It is interesting to see this story of a young man forced by family matters and his own brave past that ended in prison, to be a stool pigeon, though he resolves to tell nothing, intends to deceive the boss. In the end he is trapped; a strike is on, he departs and his wife and child are left without him.

Mr. Maltz writes his piece straight, without a flicker. It might be possible, of course, that when a strike is talked, the young hero could have had sense enough to tell his secret to his fellow miners. But such motivations are left out of "Black Pit," and there is something pathetic in the very incoherence of the young man. By keeping thematically to a single track of white and black, the dramatist has managed a genuine theatrical effect. On such a single track the play moves easily forward; you watch it tensely.

And yet it is clear to any student of drama that, while such absolute singleness and exclusion in the point of view may lead to better coördination and definity in a theatrical piece, it also limits any profounder scope. Mr. Maltz, in a sense, says more, probably, by saying less. He has evolved a play that is no less humanly true by being socially limited. In so far as "Black Pit" is good as art, it is good through its concentration of feeling and motif, and because of the effective translation of its elements into character.

On its esthetic side, which, doubtless, means nothing except the mere magic and vital persuasion of "Black Pit" (the part of it that will last beyond its indignation and dogma), we may say that this play brings up a curious point which, it seems to me, such readers as are not hotly concerned with unions and capital, have a right to see recorded. Take, say, "Hamlet," for an example—it is generally admitted that Shakespeare could never get this play quite written, and that this same partial frustration on the dramatist's side is one reason for that wonderful effect of tragic frustration, not only in the central character but in the play's fullest scope. It is for the very reverse reason that Mr. Maltz's play comes off (and is smallish). He has it all as clear as day. From step to step the story moves, with plenty of suspense, a mass of good theatre, a distinct conflict, and so to the end. One of the ways of keeping the theatre alive is to know what you want; and here in this case the dramatist has a wholly distinct perspective, as clear, though more broadly modern, as that of the mine owners themselves. Whether it is any more human than the mine owners' will depend on the definition of "human."

As to social plays, the Theatre Union's program has horizon enough to print "social" in quotes. Otherwise we might conclude that they did not know that a play like Molière's "Tartuffe" is, in a more complex and brilliant manner, every whit as social as "Black Pit." Confining our observation to "Black Pit," we might say that, from any civilized perspective, the boss is as much of a problem as the rest of that mining situation. If the miners get their rights, what next? The boss has got his rights, what a mess! The situation of the workers, in this play at least, seems easily solved, if it can be solved at all. But who will create the boss and his redemption? Both problems are, in a way of speaking, vital.

The production of "Black Pit" is sincere throughout, and exhibits a distinct growth in professional attack on the Theatre Union's part. It is far more interesting as sheer theatre entertainment than most of the plays on Broadway. It has a point of view behind it. It makes pieces like "De Luxe" seem puerile and imbecile, as well as *vieux jeu*. Its honest production makes the Theatre Guild's production of Mr. Maxwell Anderson's "Valley Forge" seem even more specious and sloppy. In "Black Pit" the performances need at present more spring and vitality—since art when it goes well is less gloomy than it is bracing and tragic. Mr. Alan Baxter, not yet a sound professional, plays the leading role with a reality, character and often fine pathos that promise much.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Plunge into Obscurantism

ORDINARILY, it would be idle to take this sort of book[1] seriously. But because it is written by a professor of Economics in a Southern school of technology, is published and endorsed by a university press (the inside flap of the jacket describes the author's program as possessing a "practicability" that is "beyond question"), and because it reflects the point of view of a constantly growing number of persons, it is imperative that this advocacy of a new plunge into obscurantism be analyzed in some detail. The Agrarianism of which Professor Cauley speaks—it may be characterized, simply, as a reversion to a non-capitalist economy of scarcity with agriculture as the chief form of economic production—already has its prophets, poets and political leaders; the present author now seeks to give this movement an economic and sociological ideology. The following is the nature of Professor Cauley's argument.

The American farmer has been despoiled economically and debauched spiritually because he has been made the victim of the market—in other words, he has been fooled into the production of farm surpluses for cash sale. How can he regain those pristine virtues that have been associated immemorably with agriculture as a way of life, to wit, "self-reliance, physical courage, moral integrity, loyalty and hospitality"? And how is he to recapture his lost economic security and freedom, both of which capitalism and collectivism seem incapable of guaranteeing? Under capitalism, indubitably, he has no security; under collectivism he will never have freedom (and when the author speaks of this latter as a "greater lack" it is at once apparent where his sympathies lie). There is a third economic system, however, where the anxious seeker will find not one but both pots of gold at the rainbow's end; and this mode of production Professor Cauley is pleased to call Agrarianism. That his Agrarianism is only a pleasant mask for the poverty and terror of feudalism never seems to have entered his mind.

By Agrarianism Professor Cauley means the individual and non-alienable ownership of small land holdings on which will be produced almost all those simple necessaries that are requisite for a self-sufficing economy. This, obviously, means scarcity; but the author refuses to be troubled by the contemplation of the rigors of a primitive existence (which, of course, will at the same time have the benefits of modern communication, education, health care and the relief of the dependent young and aged) as long as the manly virtues of self-reliance, courage, etc., will again be associated with the national character. There are certain difficulties in the attainment of Agrarianism, and the author does not brush them aside lightly. What is this independent American freeholder, who is to turn his back contemptuously on the market, to do about acquiring his property, sloughing off his fixed charges of mortgage payments and taxes, assuring himself of his social services, and acquiring those other necessaries he himself cannot produce? After all, even the American backswoodsmen needed salt, iron and squirrel rifles.

Professor Cauley comes to grips with some of these problems in an altogether candid fashion; one does not find in this book, for example, the increasingly turbid eloquence that has come to be synonymous with the utterances of so many of our contemporary agricultural statesmen. In the first place, holds the author, if all farmers stopped paying the services on their mortgage debts, the land would lose its value and the cultivators could repossess their properties for virtually nothing. If this should not work out exactly to specification, there would always be the public trough: the government could be called upon to finance easy acquisition. Second, the burden of taxation should be placed where it belongs, on incomes and sales, and since the farmers would produce no surpluses and buy nothing, naturally they would escape the tax-collector. Third, the social services of protection, roads, schools, hospitals and child and old-age care would be supplied by the state. And finally, as regards those necessaries that farmers would have to get somehow, the abandonment of the whole system of tariffs would bring prices down to their true levels; it is to be assumed, since farmers would have no cash, that kettles, guns, bullets, salt, spices, coffee and tea would be sold for nothing.

This, then is what Agrarianism comes to: there will exist simultaneously two types of economy, the capitalist economy under which the means of production (except land) would continue to rest in the hands of an exploiting class; and the agrarian economy in which, isolated from the market, simple Arcadians would delve and spin for themselves alone. Who would feed and clothe those industrial populations that, in the final analysis, would furnish the free farmers their social services, Professor Cauley does not say: one may only conjecture that it would be those backward areas of the world whose peoples had not yet learned of the blessings of American Agrarianism.

This is the sort of intellectual stultification at which so many Americans today have arrived. There can be nothing more vicious and corrupting than such evidences in our modern life of a nostalgic yearning for an agrarian past that never really has existed anywhere. Professor Cauley, apparently, cannot see that the position of his peasants must increasingly become more brutish as their lack of cash makes it impossible for them to maintain their soil at a high level of productivity; and that the constant contraction of the market, as a result of the retirement of more and more people into self-sufficiency, must inevitably wipe out all those great gains capitalism in its progressive period achieved—technology, mass production and the hope of realizing abundance. What dispossessed industrial worker for a single day would want to continue living in his slum dwelling and risking the hazards of the labor market when he, too, could retreat into a self-sufficiency in which, at the same time, he might have his social services? In time the movement would sap the foundations of our whole industrial economy—as a similar movement destroyed Rome in the West—and leave only the misery, squalor, starvation, terror and superstition of a new feudalism.

Professor Cauley and the widening group for which he speaks in this book strain at gnats and swallow the camel: they want freedom and think they will arrive at it through scarcity, failing to appreciate that if the logic of history has demonstrated one thing it has been that scarcity leads to struggle and ends with oppression. The Lombard plain of Italy and the Champagne plain of France, because they

[1] Agrarianism: A Program for Farmers, by Troy J. Cauley. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 211 pages. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were desirable, for centuries were filled with the tread of soldiers and their soils were kept fertile by the blood of countless men, women and children; and the serfs who labored in their fields rendered up fealty and paid their feudal dues to whatever masters happened to be in control. This is the security and freedom that Professor Cauley's agrarian way of life ultimately must come to: it is the acceptance of the bestiality and hopelessness of feudalism when still within our grasp lies the possibility of attaining true abundance and liberty. Nothing could be more symptomatic of the dangers we are threatened by than the fact that a professor of Economics in a school of technology can, in a book addressed to a literate public, invariably put the words Science and Progress between quotation marks.

LOUIS M. HACKER.

Eyes East

The Great Wall Crumbles, by Grover Clark. New York: The Macmillan Company. 422 pages. $3.50.

Sun Yat-sen: His Life and Its Meaning, by Lyon Sharman. New York: The John Day Company. 435 pages. $3.50.

China's Story, by William Elliot Griffis and Arthur Walworth. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 346 pages. $2.50.

Understand the Chinese, by William Martin. New York: Harper and Brothers. 262 pages. $2.50.

Confucianism and Modern China, by Reginald F. Johnston. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 272 pages. $3.50.

OF THESE five volumes, only the first two represent contributions toward an understanding of China that are both new and worth while. Drawing on the background of his years of experience in China as teacher, newspaper editor and famine-relief administrator, Grover Clark has produced a full, rich study of this central character in the Far Eastern drama. The historical forces that have molded China in the past, and that still largely condition its development, are skillfully woven into a pattern that primarily reveals and interprets the China of the present. Throughout, the treatment is notably sympathetic, displaying an appreciative grasp of the essential qualities of Chinese civilization and its potential contribution to the Western world. Grover Clark's volume is in fact excellent enough to warrant considering a modification of certain of its emphases.

In the first chapter, the relative-congestion-of-population theory is pushed far beyond its proper limits. To attribute the rise of Fascism and Nazism in Europe to the increasing congestion of population is, to say the least, stretching a point. The importance of this issue lies in the fact that it is symptomatic of the author's failure to appraise realistically either the causes underlying the contemporary breakdown of capitalist economy, or the results of this phenomenon. One of the clearest manifestations of the crisis of capitalism is the intensified pressure of the imperialist Powers on all the colonial areas of the world. Though Mr. Clark gives full weight to Japanese aggression, he subscribes to the common belief that the Western Powers are prepared to relinquish their special privileges in China. Furthermore, he maintains that Chinese industrial and commercial advance is progressively reclaiming China's economic life from foreign domination. This thesis might have been disputed even in 1930, but under the conditions of 1935 it is wholly untenable. The present crisis in the Chinese cotton industry, recently analyzed by Leonard Wu in the Institute of Pacific Relations' "Far Eastern Survey," testifies clearly to the catastrophic effects of intensified foreign competition on China's industrial development.

One of the best features of the book is its reasonable and objective analysis of the Chinese Communist movement. Unfortunately, Mr. Clark prefaces this section by the usual statement that the Nanking outrages of March, 1927, were committed by the Communists. Though this belief is widely entertained, it is known to Chinese who participated in the events of the period that the Nanking incident was the work of a set of Chiang Kai-shek's gangsters. The successful use of this early example of the "Reichstag fire" dodge enabled Chiang Kai-shek to come forward as the protector of the foreigners against alleged Communist excesses.

Lyon Sharman's "Sun Yat-sen" constitutes the first full-length critical biography of the great Chinese revolutionary leader that has so far appeared in English. Though future research, especially in Chinese sources, will undoubtedly supply additional information on certain aspects of Sun Yat-sen's career, it is not likely that the main outlines of his life history as set down here will be substantially altered. The biography is distinguished by its courageous unwillingness to truckle to the apotheosis of Sun Yat-sen that the Kuomintang authorities have encouraged in order to wrap themselves in his halo. The result is a well rounded, objective picture of the man and his views that will go far to prevent the real Sun Yat-sen from ever disappearing in the mist of legendary accretions. His autocratic—often arbitrary—ways, his political naïveté, the foreignization induced by his education and upbringing, and the lack of thorough assimilation of his encyclopedic Western learning, are all dispassionately analyzed. At the same time full credit is given to his disinterested love of country, courage and idealism, dogged persistence in the face of disaster, personal magnetism, and his gift of stirring masses of men to action for high purposes. These positive qualities were displayed to best advantage in the long hard years between 1895 and 1911, when the revolution that finally overthrew the Manchus was maturing. But the last twelve years of his life were wasted in the pursuit of aims that were, by their very nature, impossible to attain.

The ill concealed anti-Soviet bias of the three chapters added to the revised edition of Griffis' "China's Story" sadly mars the urbanity of this little classic. . . . William Martin's impressions of the Chinese scene, formed after a brief visit in 1933, are interesting as the reactions of a trained observer of international affairs. Nevertheless, they are often superficial, while at times they go far astray, notably in the assertion that Japan fosters Chinese communism in order to embarrass Chiang Kai-shek. . . . Reginald Johnston, as befits his role of special pleader for all that is reactionary in the Far East, adds to his laurels in this latest work by glorifying Chiang Kai-shek's prostitution of Confucianism to fascist ends in the New Life Movement. Similarly, he finds the Confucian political concept of *wang tao,* or the "kingly way"—utilized by the Japanese imperialists as a justification for their activities in Manchuria in a sense analogous to the Western term "white man's burden"—to have been brought forward freely and spontaneously by the Chinese puppets in the Manchukuo regime. Sir Reginald even feels that when the ideas of world brotherhood and universal peace, immanent in the principle of *wang tao,* become rooted in Manchuria they may spread to Japan and prove embarrassing to the Japanese military leaders.

T. A. BISSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"A Cabin, a Garden"

Don't You Weep; Don't You Moan, by Richard Coleman. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

Ollie Miss, by George Wylie Henderson. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. $2.50.

MR. COLEMAN'S is another of those quaint books about Negroes by a white Southerner who understands them. Set in Charleston, it abounds in fried fish, dialect, spirituals and razor fights. Mr. Coleman's observation of these things is probably accurate and his reproduction of them both spirited and faithful. The book's great charm, however, lies in his use of white folklore. Thus Lasses, the Gullah heroine, "had in her line an infusion of white blood." And how come the white man knows this? —"her lips were full but not too full. . . . Her eyes were bright and intelligent. But there the manifestations of her white blood ended." When Tater, her lover, felt a strange contentment on the primitive sea island, he "did not understand. . . . He did not know that, to a black man, 'a cabin, a garden and a cotton field' are his simple and ultimate goal. It is his black heritage." Mr. Coleman, however, being white, understands it all perfectly.

Mr. Henderson's novel deals with rural Negroes in an unspecified part of the Deep South. It is outstanding in its simplicity, its matter-of-fact realism, its almost stark lack of quaintness. Mr. Henderson writes apparently from a familiarity with his material so great that he can take it for granted. While his Negro sharecroppers also attend dances and camp meetings, sing spirituals and flash occasional razors, his lovely narrative carries conviction though he uses dialect and local color only incidentally. At its close his heroine is also on her way toward "a cabin, a garden and a cotton field." Much as it might surprise Mr. Coleman, she also knew why this made her happy. "She had something to look forward to—a farm of her own. . . . Green things would grow . . . nurtured by the strength of her hands. . . . Things that gave fruit in return for the sweat of her toil."

MARTHA GRUENING.

Elinor Wylie

Elinor Wylie: The Portrait of an Unknown Lady, by Nancy Hoyt. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 203 pages. $2.50.

IN THIS book Elinor Wylie's younger sister reminisces with unflagging and revolting cheeriness about the more superficial aspects of the poet's life. Her writing is pretty terrible: not much touching-up would be required to convert her volume into an excellent burlesque along the lines of Anita Loos's "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes," or one of Ring Lardner's moron autobiographies. Bad as it is, however, both in what it says and in what it omits, the book will have to be consulted by the student who is seriously interested in Elinor Wylie's life. Moreover, the shallowness of the book gives it value of a curious and surprising nature, for it exposes, in their infantile nakedness, the upper-class attitudes and prejudices that unconsciously colored the subtler operations of the poet's mind. And not even Miss Hoyt's genius for banality can obscure the pathos of Elinor Wylie's later years, worn down by her struggle to find peace and a decent place to live and get some decent work done, in spite of the imminent corruption of death and the vitiating atmosphere of her literary set.

The book lacks both an index and a table of contents. There are several illustrations: photographs of the poet as child, girl and young woman; and some rather unsatisfactory snapshots. The sonnet, "To Nancy," is reproduced in facsimile of the manuscript in Elinor Wylie's own handwriting. Two songs, written during intervals of working on the sonnets of her sequence in "Angels and Earthly Creatures," are here printed for the first time; and there are seven poems from a privately printed book, "Incidental Numbers." These juvenilia have little importance, save that one poem, "The Fairy," shows how the poet came, through the influence of Poe, to her later characteristic virtuosity of manner. The dustjacket intimates that the quatrain "Sea Blue Eyes," printed as the last item in the book, is hitherto unpublished material. This claim, however, is not made in the text, and as a matter of fact The Century printed the poem in 1921. To it there might have been added another quatrain similar in style, which appeared that same year in The New Republic, and has not been published, either, in her four books of verse. It is called "Venetian Interior":

> Allegra, rising from her canopied dreams,
> Slides both white feet across the slanted beams
> Which lace the peacock jalousies: behold
> An idol of fine clay, with feet of gold.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES.

Caste

Fourscore: An Autobiography, by Robert Grant. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 413 pages. $3.50.

JUDGE GRANT grew up with the aristocracy of Boston, which has defined in a special way the personality of the city. As a novelist of the silver age he studied their manners, and as probate judge he studied their wills. His remark that though Howells knew the immigrant in Silas Lapham, his knowledge of the Bromfield Coreys was but skin deep, is his own claim to be to the manner born. From his pages of delightful reminiscence emerges Boston of the eighties and nineties with its discreet pleasures and gentle decencies, a companion piece to Henry Adams' picture of the city a generation earlier. And there emerges also a character of rare and delicate, if somewhat diffident charm—a Boston gentleman whose inherited Puritanism has become a matter of scruples and shades of conduct, who says his prayers "on bended knees" both night and morning, who never had a cocktail shaker in his house until after his sons left college, who never played poker after he went on the bench (except at week-end parties), and who confesses a "minor concern" of his life in preserving the spelling of his grandmother's name, Bordman.

Judge Grant's most distinguished public service was as member of the committee appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts to advise him in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti. Whatever his family and intimates thought of his acceptance, the general public had confidence in him. That President Lowell's social myopia prevented his seeing clearly any human beings beyond his brahmin circle, that Stratton was merely a yes-man, were regretfully conceded; but Grant had been a Massachusetts judge. Obviously he should have been chairman of the Commission, but with his usual self-effacement he notes that Lowell took the central place, and, "with one of us on either side, was usually the spokesman." Earlier in his memoirs Judge Grant tells us of a case in which he found himself in a minority of one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among several fellow judges and reasoned: "'What am I to hold out against all the rest?' So I gave in and reluctantly followed their lead, although they were wrong." The basic question before the Sacco-Vanzetti Committee was whether the trial could have been fairly conducted before a judge who cried to the world: "Did you see what I did to those anarchist bastards?" and whether it was proper that he alone should pass upon the question of his own prejudice. Judge Grant was "amazed and incensed that any Massachusetts judge could have been so garrulous," but the committee could not find anything improper in Judge Thayer's charge to the jury. It did not take account of the manner in which he delivered that charge. Judge Grant makes a pathetic plea for faith in the honesty of the committee in their tragic decision. He shows his animus, however, in his slur upon the protesting writers and artists who "paraded like dancing dervishes before the State House." It is an ironic circumstance that the place in history that Boston and Harvard could not confer on their favorite son, he owes to his fortuitous connection with two humble Italians who, as Mr. De Voto remarked recently, and the world now believes, "were executed because the ruling class did not like their political beliefs."

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

The Healing Art

American Medicine, by Henry E. Sigerist. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 336 pages, illustrated. $4.

The Doctor in History, by Howard W. Haggard. New Haven: Yale University Press. 408 pages, illustrated. $3.75.

AN INTELLIGENT history of American medicine, written by a German scholar of French descent, and concluding on a note of genuine admiration for the socialized medical work of the Soviet Union—that is something new. Dr. Sigerist, formerly of Leipzig, now William H. Welch Professor of the History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins, believes that "while Europe is becoming more and more reactionary and mystical . . . the United States of America and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics today are the two countries that are experimenting in the medical field and are seeking new forms of medical service. They, first of all, will determine the future of medicine." This will be heresy to Dr. Morris Fishbein and the American Medical Association, but behind the calm statement is a body of evidence, taken from the past records and present practices of medicine in this country, whose skillful presentation in Dr. Sigerist's volume will require much more than a devotion to rugged individualism to neutralize. The factual material in such chapters as "The Physician and the Patient," "Hospitals and Nursing," "Preventive Medicine" and "Medical Science" is exceptionally rich; and the very full treatment of various health-insurance plans will lead many readers to agree with the author that "medicine must be freed from economic fetters."

Dr. Haggard's latest volume continues the spirit of his earlier ones on the history of medicine. It is, in effect, an "outline" of the healing art, beginning with magical practices and ending with modern laboratory research. Designed consciously for the general reader, it favors the dramatic and the anecdotal, but with sufficient restraint to permit the underlying continuity of medical knowledge to reveal itself. There is no attempt to make the story "edifying" or to gull the reader with moral homilies. HAROLD WARD.

"Wisdom Lingers"

Social Judgment, by Graham Wallas. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 175 pages. $1.75.

THIS LITTLE book is the first part of a volume that Graham Wallas was working on in 1932 before he died. The first part discusses the nature and history of the process of forming judgments; and the second part, if finished, would have dealt with the institutions through which judgment influences social action. As an administrator, as well as a political psychologist, Wallas was keenly conscious of the difficulties in both thought and action that arise when the scientific and factual—so-called objective—processes of thought are divorced from the total personality. This divorce leaves a residue of emotional and subjective elements that are not brought under humane discipline or effectively utilized for the actual work in hand. Wallas was in search of a method that would permit the objective and subjective elements in judgment to be fused in a single operation. He might have quoted Tennyson's line, "Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers," and it was wisdom that he was finally seeking. This last book of his is a criticism of the prevailing division in the records of the mind; a criticism and a plea. Those who knew him may still hear in it his tense, high-pitched voice, anxiously explosive, attempting to communicate a method that he had not yet been able to reduce to a formula. Wallas, at least, was fully conscious of the need for uniting the two hemispheres of thought, the objective and the subjective, and he knew that before this could happen they must both be constructed to the same scale. If he left the effective solution for his successors, he at all events pointed out the way. LEWIS MUMFORD.

Books in Brief

The Fool of Love: A Life of William Hazlitt, by Hesketh Pearson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 285 pages. $3.50.

WILLIAM HAZLITT'S life was a short but not a merry one. He is reputed to have made the reputation of the actor, Kean, endure to the present day; he wrote one of the best existing descriptions of a prize fight; he wrote essays that were not polite, that had the full strength of English prose. Yet he was a tortured, wretched, poor and mostly friendless man, whatever the weight of his writings. More extensive biographies of Hazlitt exist, but these have elided the story that gives a name to this biography. As told by Pearson after Hazlitt's own "Liber Amoris," the love tragedy, with all its rooming-house atmosphere, has an immediate, sordid bitterness that brings Hazlitt alive and kicking out of the school of English essayists. The story, well worth the space it gets, is an epitome, in its way, of a vanished society. It should send people to reading Hazlitt himself, a service not every biographer can perform for his subject. K. W.

Seven Poor Men of Sydney, by Christina Stead. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. $2.50.

In this remarkable novel, Australia is the final tragic land where seven men are doomed (or saved only in pieces), by their times, their poverty and themselves. There are strains, not echoes, of other novelists here—Dostoevsky, Wassermann—but the strains seem the inheritance of the tortured minds of the characters, not the limitations of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

author. There is a debt to the Joyce of "Dubliners" and Stephen Dedalus; the debt is paid in full with the quickness of the reality perceived and the splendid writing. The novel, in a way, with the symbolic reference that its every simple and very real act has, possesses a curious dream quality, the dream quality of a modern, frantic world. Yet scenes like that of Michael's farewell, in all their loose, sprawling, immediate drama, have a smashing reality that you have only to look out your window to see. "Seven Poor Men of Sydney" is not a simple novel; it moves tortuously and deviously, it is depressing, it is tragic and actual. The writing alone would make the book deserve all the attention it can get. K. W.

The Lindbergh Crime, by Sidney Whipple. New York: Blue Ribbon Books. 357 pages, illustrated. $1.

Intended as a "definitive history" of "the crime of the century" and "the trial of the century"—which leaves you out, Mr. Dimitrov—this account of the Lindbergh case will not bore those members of the rubber tribe whom three years of headlined hullabaloo could not deter from standing vigil at Flemington to purchase miniature kidnap ladders. The author is a star United Press reporter and, within limits set by himself, he appears to have done a competent job. He describes some of the more interesting manias drawn into the open by the case, especially that of the Norfolk shipbuilder Curtis, who concocted a complete story of the kidnaping and its perpetrators out of his financially worried mind. For the rest, he tells a straightforward and detailed story of the case in its essential development, ending with the conviction of the Bronx carpenter who tried to climb to financial success on a ladder that broke down. M. X. G.

National Music, by Ralph Vaughan Williams. New York: The Oxford University Press. 155 pages. $1.75.

Books like this one only serve to emphasize the need for a careful, adequately documented study of the relation between folk music and art or cultivated music. For this one—originally a series of lectures at Bryn Mawr College under the Mary Flexner lectureship—is fragmentary and superficial, and its contentions are not supported by specific musical illustration. B. H. H.

A Correction

In the line giving publisher and price of J. Leslie Mitchell's book, in our issue of April 10, "Earth Conquerors" was incorrectly listed as "Death Conquerors." The title, however, appeared correctly in the text of the review.—THE EDITORS.

Contributors

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, professor of Sociology at New York University, is the author, among other books, of "The Foundations of Social Life," "Elements of Social Science" and "Profits or Prosperity."

H. N. BRAILSFORD is the London correspondent of The New Republic.

LOLA RIDGE, the author of several books of poems, including "The Ghetto and Other Poems," "Sun Up" and "Firehead," has just been awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship. The two sonnets printed in this issue are taken from her new book, "Dance of Fire," which Smith and Haas will publish on April 22.

MAURICE SAGOFF lives in Revere, Massachusetts.

LOUIS M. HACKER is a native New Yorker who graduated from Columbia University in the same class as Matthew Josephson and Joseph Freeman. He is the author, with B. B. Kendrick, of "The United States Since 1865," now being used as a textbook in some 200 colleges. He is also the author of a pamphlet, "The Farmer Is Doomed," published by the John Day Company in 1934, and a second book, "A Short History of the New Deal," was also published last year. He is to lecture in the Department of Economics at Columbia University this summer.

T. A. BISSON, a member of the research staff of the Foreign Policy Association since 1929, writes frequently on international affairs.

MARTHA GRUENING has been a student of race relations for many years and contributes articles on this and related subjects to various magazines.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES, poet and critic, is working on a book of criticism dealing with poets of the last twenty years.

HAROLD WARD contributes articles on scientific subjects to the magazines

LEWIS MUMFORD's most recent book, published last year, was "Technics and Civilization." He has written on architecture, art, literature and the social sciences.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Kenneth White, Murray Godwin (M. X. G.) and B. H. Haggin.

COOPER UNION
Dept. of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
8th Street and Astor Place—at 8 o'clock
Admission Free
IN THE GREAT HALL
Tuesday, April 23rd
WILLIAM B. CURRY
"Can Freedom Be Preserved in a Planned Society?"

MUSIC LOVERS— 100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc. MAIL ORDERS, CATALOGUE. THE GRAMOPHONE SHOP Inc. 18 East 48th Street New York City

ARE YOU BORED TO DEATH
by your moron environment? Send 3c stamp for unique plan of connecting the mentally isolated by correspondence. CONTACTS, Box 91, Station D, New York City.

BOOKS

5¢ EACH **LITTLE BLUE BOOKS**
Send postcard for our FREE CATALOGUE. Thousands of bargains. Address: HALDEMAN-JULIUS CO., Catalogue Dept. Desk M-135 GIRARD, KANSAS

23 LANGUAGES
SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR OWN HOME..SEND FOR FREE BOOK
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
41 *Rockefeller Center · New York*

FOR SALE

In the hills. Completely converted century-old barn—five bedrooms—modern bathrooms—G. E. oil furnace—separate studio—heated garage—Enquire Mrs. Arthur Titus, Washington, Conn.

MOHEGAN COLONY
where land values have not been affected throughout the depression, has a number of desirable acre plots for sale in new section. Lake rights with each parcel. 3½ miles from Peekskill, N. Y. Call or phone. Eva Brandes, 122 E. 84th St. LEx. 2-4468.

ORANGES FOR SALE

ORANGES, sweet, juicy, sun-ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, $3.50; bushel basket. Grapefruit, $3.00; Mixed fruit, $3.50. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Fla.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M. D.
and
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
Office hours: 1—2, 6—8
Except Sundays and Holidays
Telephones:
GRamercy 7-2090 — GRamercy 7-2091

La FOLLETTE'S
GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
THE PROGRESSIVE
Regular Price $1.50 Per Year
A unique publication free from big business influence. No paid advertising. Facts suppressed by other papers exposed in every issue. Inside story of new Third Party. How the La Follettes would break the depression and solve our economic problems. Many more sensational features!
TWO BIG SPECIAL OFFERS
1 YEAR ... (52 issues) ..... $1 10 WEEKS ... (10 issues) ... 20c
Why do newspapers fool the public by distorting and suppressing news? Get the answer and the true facts from The Progressive!
Don't Miss The Next Few Startling Issues—Order Today!
THE PROGRESSIVE, DEPT. NB, MADISON, WISCONSIN

LAUNDRY

LOWEST Prices in City. Full list on request. Strictly hand-work. Bachelor service. Call and delivery in Manhattan. 10 percent trial discount to New Republic readers. Greenwich Village Private Hand Laundry, 14 Washington Place East. SPring 7-3769.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED